DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 515 IR 052 120

AUTHOR	Lane, Martha A.
TITLE	A Summary and Evaluation of the California Literacy Campaign Retreat (Asilomar, California, February 25-27, 1987).
INSTITUTION	California State Library, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Feb 87
NOTE	135p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Literacy; Adult Reading Programs; Financial Support; *Library Planning; *Library Services; *Literacy Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Public Libraries; Records (Forms); *State Libraries; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	California; *California Literacy Campaign; *Retreats

ABSTRACT

This report provides a summary and evaluation of a retreat held for the directors and literacy coordinators of the 46 public libraries participating in the California Literacy Campaign (CLC), their supervisors, State Library staff, and members of the California Library Services Board. Following a brief introduction and overview, descriptions of retreat sessions include: (1) "The Purpose and Vision of the CLC"; (2) "Shared Experiences and Learnings"; (3) "Identification of Priority Issues and Options"; (4) "Making Literacy an Integral Library Service"; (5) "State and Public Library Roles in the California Literacy Campaign"; and (6) "Observations and Recommendations." In addition, appendices incorporated in the body of the report in chronological order provide the following information: (1) the agenda; (2) the keynote address by Gary Strong, state librarian; (3) "The Purpose and Vision of the California Literacy Campaign" (Gary Strong); (4) group assignments; (5) questions and comments addressed to the state librarian; (6) issues brainstormed by groups; (7) large group brainstorming on funds; (8) the directors' ad hoc discussion of funding; (9) the retreat evaluation form; (10) tabulations of evaluations; and (11) evaluations by coordinators, directors, staff, supervisors, persons not self-identified, and board members. Listings of retreat participants by library, California State Library staff and California State Library Services Board retreat participants, retreat resource people, and retreat participant changes are included in a general appendix. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED286515

A Summary and Evaluation
of

THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT

held
February 25-27, 1987
at
Asilomar Conference Center
Asilomar, California

Submitted to
Mr. Gary E. Strong
State Librarian
CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY

by
Martha A. Lane
Outside Evaluator for the Retreat

IR052120

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Collin Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary and Evaluation
of

THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT

held
February 25-27, 1987
at
Asilomar Conference Center
Asilomar, California

Submitted to
Mr. Gary E. Strong
State Librarian
CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY

by
Martha A. Lane
Outside Evaluator for the Retreat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....i

A SUMMARY OF THE CALIFORNIA LIBERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT.....ii

Recommendations.....v

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Desired Outcomes.....1
Purpose and Methods of the Evaluation.....2
Organization of this Report.....3

II. OVERVIEW OF THE RETREAT..... 4

Appendix II-a: Agenda.....7
Appendix II-b: Keynote Address by Gary Strong..10

III. THE PURPOSE AND VISION OF THE C.L.C..... 14

Participants' Expectations.....14
Three-Question Check of Shared Understanding....16
1. How Well are Adult Learner-Centered Objectives Working?.....16
2. Coalition-Building--How Far Along is It? What's to be Done?.....19
3. How is it Working to Leave the Teaching Methodology up to the Local Library? How Well is Your Methodology Working?.....22
Appendix III-a: The Purpose and Vision of the California Literacy Campaign: Address by Gary E. Strong.....25
Appendix III-b: List of Group Assignments.....29
Appendix III-c: Questions and Comments Addressed to the State Librarian.....32

IV. SHARED EXPERIENCES AND LEARNINGS.....36
Library Directors' Responses.....36
Supervisors' Responses.....38
Coordinators' Responses.....40

V. IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITY ISSUES AND OPTIONS.....43
Supervisors' Priority Issues and Options.....43
Library Directors' Priority Issues and Options..45
Coordinators' Priority Issues and Options.....47
Appendix V-a: Issues Brainstormed, by Group....50
Appendix V-b: Large Group Brainstorm re Funds..56
Appendix V-c: Directors' Ad Hoc Discussion of Funding.....58

VI. MAKING LITERACY AN INTEGRAL LIBRARY SERVICE.....60
Question 1: How are Adult Literacy and Learning Programs Becoming a Part of Public Library Services?.....60
Question 2: How Can Adult Literacy and Learning Programs Become a Part of Library Services?.66

VII. STATE AND PUBLIC LIBRARY ROLES IN THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN.....69
CLC Campaign Retreat Closing Remarks by Strong..70

VIII. OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....76

Observations.....76
Participant Evaluation of Specific Retreat Segments.....82
Recommendations.....84
Appendix VIII-a: Evaluation Form.....86
Appendix VIII-b: Tabulations of Evaluations.....88
Appendix VII-c: Coordinators' Open-Ended Evaluations.....94
Appendix VIII-d: Library Directors' Open-ended Evaluations.....100
Appendix VIII-e: State Library Staff Open-ended Evaluations.....105
Appendix VIII-f: Supervisors' Open-ended Evaluations.....106
Appendix VIII-g: Open-ended Evaluations by Persons not Self-Identified.....109
Appendix VIII-h: CLS Board Members' Open-ended Evaluations.....111

IX. GENERAL APPENDIX.....113

CLC Retreat Participant List by Library.....115
California State Library Staff (at retreat).....124
California Library Services Board (at retreat).125
Retreat Resource People.....126
CLC Retreat Changes (re participants).....127

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was completed in a relatively short time, thanks to a lot of excellent help from many people.

Thanks to the California State Library Staff for invaluable feedback and other assistance before, during and after the retreat. I'm especially indebted to Gary E. Strong, Nancy W. Percy, Paul Kiley, Cameron Robertson, Carmella Ruby and Sandy Martin.

Thanks to the following Lutheran Church Women staff persons for helping with typing, editing and other tasks: Kathleen Nicholas, Karen Dahmer and Paddy Evans. Thanks, also to Suzanne Kevis for tabulating the questionnire responses quickly and cheerfully.

Special thanks to Marilyn Snider and her Facilitator/Recorder teams who produced the most readable conference newsprint sheets I've ever seen!

It was truly a joy to work with the above-named and with all the participants at the retreat.

Martin Lowe
4/15/87

A SUMMARY OF THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT

On February 25-27, 1987, the California Literacy Campaign (CLC) held a retreat for directors and literacy coordinators and their supervisors of the 46 public libraries participating in the CLC with State Library Staff and members of the California Library Services Board (which administers the California Literacy Campaign).

The think-tank event drew on the experience and expertise of CLC participants, under the direction of the State Librarian assisted by outside facilitators, to "develop a shared, agreed-upon vision of the direction and purpose of the Campaign over the next five years, and...consider some processes to accomplish this goal." The retreat, CLC's first, was in direct response to requests from the field and from State Library staff for an opportunity for collective, in-depth sharing and planning.

Three addresses by the State Librarian, one on each day of the retreat, provided a framework for small- and large-group discussions. Participants first addressed three crucial questions faced by library literacy projects--questions which the CLC, program effectiveness reviews and the Retreat Advisory Group earlier had identified as crucial areas of concern and program operation. Then participants shared what they had learned as a result of their involvement in CLC. In discussing priority issues and possible options for action, participants first brainstormed issues, then prioritized them. The next step, developing possible options, was a brainstorm activity. Lastly, participants turned their attention to how literacy can and is becoming integrated into regular library services.

Following are the questions posed to participants during the retreat, with a summary of participant responses.

1. How well are adult learner-centered objectives working?

Learner-centered objectives (in which students set the objectives upon which their literacy instruction is planned and by which their progress is evaluated) are working "generally very well, indeed", participants agreed. While such an approach requires more specialized training of tutors than traditional tutoring does, the results have been worth the extra work. Students are learning what they most need and want to learn.

Concern was expressed that some literacy-related programs such as GAIN require standardized tests and are unrealistic

in how long it takes adult learners to acquire basic literacy skills.

2. Coalition-building--How far along is it? What's left to be done?

Every program is doing some kind of coalition-building in its local community. Most often it is one of two types: all literacy service providers, or councils and alliances in which a broad spectrum of community groups are represented. Groups involved with CLC in coalitions include: other literacy volunteer groups, adult schools, sheriff's departments, California Conversation Corps, unions, Y's, business and community colleges, prisons, substance abuse programs, newspapers, foundations, neighborhood watch groups, all types of businesses and government agencies and ABC and PBS television, through their PLUS campaign.

Coalitions have resulted in many improvements of service to those in need, such as: area-wide tollfree literacy information and referral numbers, money and other types of resources and closer cooperation with other adult education programs.

While some projects have been successful in obtaining major local funds with coalition help, most find that it is easier to obtain many types of inkind help than to obtain significant, longterm funding.

3. How is it working to leave the teaching methodology up to the local library? How well is your methodology working?

Most projects have adapted Laubach Literacy or Literacy Volunteers of America materials to their situation--often by using a combination of materials and techniques. Others have developed most of their curricula on their sites. Participants stressed the advantage of such flexibility for meeting the needs of both individuals and the communities in which they live and work.

In some projects, increased numbers of learning disabled adults are asking for help. This is an issue of concern because it is unclear what methodology would work well, whether volunteers can be trained adequately to teach persons with such special needs, and so on.

4. What have you learned as a result of your involvement in the CLC?

Often mentioned responses included: Politics plays a bigger role in funding programs than does the intrinsic value of

the program. The literacy program must be integrated into the library, not appended to it. Much of the success of the CLC has been due to statewide effort and outstanding media cooperation. The library does have a role in education--the library is an educational institution. The literacy problem is much greater than imagined and much greater than our ability to meet it. Volunteers have given CLC amazing support. People who need tutoring DO come forward when they hear about a library reading program--the library seems to be regarded as a "safe place".

"It's the most successful community program we offer--and the community sees it," one summarized.

5. What are the priority issues surrounding CLC's literacy efforts?

Each group was asked to identify five priority issues. They were as follows, listed in priority order:

Library Directors:

Funding and Evaluation
Integrating Literacy with Regular Library Services
Dealing with Program Growth
Role of State Library-especially with Fundraising; making Literacy a State/Federal Priority
Providing Services to non-CLC Funded Areas

Supervisors:

Obtain Secure Funding
Integrate Literacy Program into Regular Library Services
Evaluate Program Effectiveness Measurements
Develop a Long Range Plan
Develop a Position Statement on Why the Literacy Program should be in the Library

Coordinators:

Funding
The Local Literacy Service: Whose Baby is it? If Library's, then Fully Integrate into all Aspects of the Library
How to Evaluate Success
Clarify Role of the State Library Consultants

6. How can Adult Literacy and Learning Programs Become/How are Adult Literacy and Learning Program Becoming a Part of Public Library Services?

Participants listed scores of ways in which literacy is becoming integrated into libraries, from such simple things as providing library cards and pre-selected books to adult literacy students to literacy staff being hired through

civil service and appearing on the library organization charts. All library staff members are being kept informed of literacy activities and library personnel spend a great deal of time presenting literacy needs and concerns to the community. A number of libraries mentioned special collections for literacy programs. Most libraries also are sites for tutor training and student-tutor meetings.

Ways to increase such integration of services, participants said, include: get into the regular library budget, develop strategies for working with city council and city managers, get lots of public support, work more closely with Friends and library boards.

Recommendations

In both written and informal evaluations, participants gave the retreat high ratings. All five expected outcomes of the retreat were met, four of them to a high degree. Participants did have some suggestions for improvement, however. The following recommendations of the evaluator reflect their major suggestions:

1. Sponsor or enable a series of one-topic seminars or workshops for CLC public library teams on the priority issues identified in the retreat.

2. Schedule a retreat open to the same participants to focus solely on long-range planning and visioning for the future.

3. Seek more channels to communicate the successes of individual programs to all CLC participants.

4. Seek to identify new allies at statewide and community levels who are involved in working for positive change, so that communities might begin to work on preventive literacy as well as direct service to the educationally disadvantaged.

I. INTRODUCTION

On February 25 - 27, 1987, a California Literacy Campaign Retreat was held at Asilomar Conference Center. This was the State Library's first attempt to convene the directors and literacy coordinators and their supervisors of the 46 public libraries participating in the California Literacy Campaign (CLC) with State Library staff and members of the California Library Services Board.

The major objective was to "develop a shared, agreed-upon vision of the direction and purpose of the Campaign over the next five years, and...consider some processes to accomplish this goal." (as stated in the LSCA Title VI Project Request) The retreat was to be a "think-tank" event which would capitalize on the experience and expertise of CLC participants, under the direction of the State Librarian, assisted by teams of trained facilitators.

Desired Outcomes

The five desired outcomes of the Retreat, as developed and refined by State Library staff and the Retreat Advisory Group, were:

1. Reaffirm the purpose and shared vision of the California Literacy Campaign

2. Identify how adult literacy and learning programs can become a part of public library services

3. Reaffirm the roles of the California State Library and of public libraries in the California Literacy Campaign

4. Share what we have learned from our experience in the California Literacy Campaign

5. Identify key issues and possible options for addressing those issues

Although the CLC has existed for three years, there had been no formal opportunity for CLC participants and State Library staff to reflect collectively on past and current experiences and plan together for the future. Many individual program participants, as well as State Library literacy development staff, had expressed the need for such an event.

Purpose and Methods of the Evaluation

A process and outcome evaluation of the event was planned. That is, the evaluator planned to: identify or predict, while the event was in process, difficulties in the procedural design or its implementation; point out any such difficulties to appropriate persons; maintain a record of procedural activities and provide information gleaned from the event which would facilitate project improvement.

This evaluation is based on the degree to which the outcomes set for the Retreat were met and on participant reaction and satisfaction. The evaluator was reminded at the outset that: "in the tradition of the California Literacy Campaign itself, the single most important criterion for evaluation must remain the individual's subjective assessment of the value of the event." Such subjective assessments were collected in a variety of ways, from anecdotal information gleaned during and after the event, to the use of a written evaluation form completed by participants toward the end of the event. The evaluator also participated in pre-retreat conference calls with the Retreat Advisory Group and State Library staff and had access to pre-retreat planning documents and the pre-retreat mailings.

Several things happened at the retreat that convinced the evaluator of the need for a more naturalistic approach to the evaluation than had originally been planned: 1)During the retreat, a number of participants expressed to the evaluator, both orally and in writing, their desire to receive as much information from the retreat as possible in "unedited and unsummarized" form, as one put it. 2) As the retreat progressed, there were several questions or comments about what information is collected for the CLC, how the information is used and how it might be acquired. Participants seemed eager to have their colleagues'ideas in writing for their future thinking and planning use. 3) It was apparent that a pluralism in values and viewpoints and experiences was a major characteristic of the assembly. 4) The retreat was blessed with outside facilitators and recorders who had previous knowledge of or experience with literacy concerns and who were highly skilled at capturing group comments on newsprint.

The evaluator, therefore, employed participant observation and unstructured interviewing, as well as the collection and recording of all materials originally written on newsprint in each small group as additional evaluation methods. An explicit attempt was made to understand the retreat as each of the groups involved (coordinators, state staff, etc.) perceived it and to preserve the language and flavor of the retreat. It is hoped that such a mixing of qualitative and quantitative techniques have had a cross-validation effect on each other.

Organization of this Report

The report begins with a brief overview of the retreat, then describes each section of the retreat by the expected outcome around which it was planned. The last chapter contains the evaluator's in-depth observations and recommendations.

In order to provide the reader with something of a "you-were-there" feeling (particularly for those not able to attend), the report follows the chronological order of the event and there is an appendix at the end of each chapter. For example, appended to Chapter I is a copy of the text of the keynote address, with which the retreat was opened.

Persons interested only in a quick review of what happened should concentrate on the Summary and on the final chapter. Others may find it helpful to heavily mark up the report as they read. All readers should be aware that this report is intended primarily as an "in-house" evaluation and planning tool, rather than for a report for general distribution to the literacy field.

"We are here as our own best think tank," the State Librarian stated in his keynote address, "and I am convinced that in this room is all the knowledge and experience that we need for discussion." This report holds as much of the knowledge and experience shared as was humanly possibly without recording every word electronically.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE RETREAT

In September, 1986, the California State Librarian requested that the Directors of every public library participating in the Campaign, the Coordinators of each California Literacy Campaign Program and their immediate supervisors (in libraries where library directors are not the immediate supervisors) attend the retreat as a team. All expenses of the team would be covered by LSCA monies, so that participation at the retreat would not be a fincancial burden to any library. California Library Services Board Members also were invited. State Library staff participants, besides the State Librarian, included: the Assistant State Librarian, the Bureau Chief of Library Development Services, Regional Consultants, Literacy and Community Organization Specialists and the CLSA Program Manager.

Following is a summary of the distributed agenda (The complete agenda is appended at the end of this chapter.):

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1987

Registration
Meeting of Facilitators and Recorders
Dinner
Evening Gathering: KEYNOTE ADDRESS by Gary Strong, State Librarian

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1987

Large Group Session:

Welcome, Purpose of the Retreat and Introductions by Yolanda Cuesta, Bureau Chief, Library Development Services

Role of the Facilitators/Recorders/Group and Agenda Review by Marilyn Snider, Facilitator

PURPOSE AND VISION OF THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN by Gary Strong, State Librarian

Small Group Sessions (four groups divided into: Library Directors, Supevisors, and two of Coordinators)

DISCUSSION of the Purpose and Vision of the California Literacy Campaign

Break

Small Group Sessions Continued (as above)
DISCUSSION: Sharing What Participants have Learned from working on the California Literacy Campaign

Lunch
Large Group Session: FEEDBACK reports from small groups
Small Group Sessions Continued (as above)

DISCUSSION: Identify and Select Five Key Issues that are Central to the California Literacy Campaign PROGRAMS

Break
Small Group Sessions Continued (as above)
Large Group Session: FEEDBACK reports from small groups reparding Priorities and Possible Options
Dinner
Evening open for Informal Gathering on Your Own

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1987
Large Group Session: Welcome and Agenda Review
Small Group Sessions (four groups of Public Library Teams)

Identify How Adult Literacy and Learning Programs are Becoming/Can Become a Part of Public Library Services

Break
Large Group Session
Report from Small Groups Regarding the Ways the Adult Literacy and Learning Programs are Becoming and Can Become a Part of Public Library Services

Lunch and Closing Remarks by Gary Strong, State Librarian

The retreat generally followed the above schedule, with the exception of Friday morning, which was altered to better meet the needs of participants-- to discuss funding concerns. A Large Group Session was added for the purpose of brainstorming short- and long-range funding ideas. (See the Chapter V appendix for results of funding brainstorm.)

The process agenda was designed to allow opportunities for sharing experiences, identifying problems, reflection, and planning for the future in a "think-tank" atmosphere. Small group work was interspersed with large group work. Key questions, based on the outcomes desired and the presentations of the State Librarian, were used to trigger discussions. Long breaks and unscheduled evenings were planned to provide opportunities for informal sharing of concerns and ideas. It was anticipated that such an agenda

would enable each participant to reset her or his agenda from time to time, then seek out the appropriate resource persons to provide further direction and insights.

The retreat formally closed with the noon meal, leaving the afternoon free for individual consultations and informal working opportunities among the participants. Although the facilitation teams were prepared to work with any such afternoon groups, their services were not requested.

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

Appendix II-a

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT AGENDA
February 25 - 27, 1987
Asilomar Conference Center

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1987

3:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Registration--Administration Building
4:00 p.m.	Meeting of Facilitators and Recorders--Heather
6:00 p.m.	Dinner-Crocker Dining Room (a private dining room at the back of the building)
7:30 p.m.	Evening Gathering--Heather Keynote Address: Gary Strong, State Librarian

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1987

8:30 a.m.	Large Group Session--Heather
	Welcome, Purpose of the Retreat and Introductions--Yolanda Cuesta, Bureau Chief, Library Development Services, California State Library
	Role of the Facilitators/Recorders/Group and Agenda Review--Marilyn Snider, Facilitator
	Purpose and Vision of the California Literacy Campaign--Gary E. Strong, State Librarian
9:00 a.m.	Small Groups Library Directors (red dots on name tags)--Toyon Supervisors (blue dot)--Acacia Coordinators (yellow dot)--Viewpoint West Coordinators (green dot)--Viewpoint East
	Discussion of the Purpose and Vision of the California Literacy Campaign
10:15 a.m.	Break for 45 minutes
11:00 a.m.	Small Groups Continued (As Above)
	Sharing What Participants have Learned from Working on the California Literacy Campaign

12:00	Lunch (library teams are encouraged to check in with each other to exchange information and perceptions)--Crocker Dining Room
1:00 p.m.	Large Group--Heather Feedback from Small Group Discussions
1:30 p.m.	Small Groups (same as a.m.) Identify and Select Five Key Issues that are Central to the California Literacy Campaign Programs
2:15 p.m.	Break for 45 minutes
3:00 p.m.	Small Groups (Same as Before the Break)
3:45 p.m.	Large Group--Heather Feedback from Small Groups Regarding Priorities and Possible Options Order for small groups: 1. Supervisors 2. Directors 3. Coordinators 4. Coordinators
4:30 p.m.	Close
6:00 p.m.	Dinner--Crocker Dining Room (private room)
7:30 p.m.	Informal Gathering on Your Own

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1987

8:30 a.m.	Large Group--Heather Welcome and Agenda Review
8:45 a.m.	Small Groups (Four Groups of Public Library Teams) Group A--Toyon Group B--Acacia Group C--Viewpoint West Group D--Viewpoint East Identify How Adult Literacy and Learning Programs are Becoming/Can Become a Part of Public Library Services

10:00 a.m.	Break for 45 Minutes--Coffee in Heather
10:45 a.m.	Large Group--Heather
	Report from Small Groups Regarding the Ways the Adult Literacy and Learning Programs are Becoming and Can Become a Part of Public Library Services
12:00	Lunch and Closing Remarks by Gary Strong--Crocker Dining Room
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Post-Conference Informal Meetings (Optional)

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT
KEYNOTE ADDRESS

February 25, 1987
Asilomar, California

Gary E. Strong
State Librarian of California

"Reading is -- and has always been -- one of my greatest joys in life. I have been taught, entertained, amused, moved, and comforted by books from my earliest days. And it is impossible for me to remember a time when books were not my constant companions." Barbara Bush has expressed the feelings of many of us in her comments for the special series the State Library Foundation is preparing to draw attention to the Year of the Reader.

Jonathan Kozol maintains that we are "no longer one nation indivisible." We have become "two nations, bitterly divided, with liberty for some, illiteracy for others, a dark and stormy future for us all." We have all entered into this enterprise because we are committed to doing something. We are committed to the premise that public libraries serve people whomever they are, whatever skills they bring, whatever their goals and dreams.

This retreat was planned to bring us together through a shared sense of positive accomplishment -- the California Literacy Campaign is the most comprehensive program in the country. Marty Lane has said that "the Campaign was an ambitious, undertaking. But after just a few month's existence, the California Literacy Campaign was showing signs of unusual success and potential." My hope is that we can spend the next few hours in an atmosphere of free-expression of opinions and exchange of information that will continue this momentum.

I am pleased that we have the opportnity to share our feelings of success and accomplishment away from the day-to-day pressures of the work routine. And that we will be able to look forward to the years ahead and to develop strategies for the future of the Literacy Campaign. Please know of my very deep appreciation for your courage, your hard work, and your commitment to what we are doing. Each of you through your hard work has contributed to success, and it is success whch is dependent on each of us as library directors, Program

Coordinators and their supervisors, the California Library Services Board, and the Staff of the California State Library.

Let us pause a moment tonight and look at our accomplishments:

We set ourselves a tough objective, that of filling locally and statewide those areas of greatest unmet need -- the focus of the Campaign shifted public and official opinion to acknowledge the need for basic literacy even in this state, and we followed up with a commitment to provide service to meet the challenge.

Illiteracy is not only the result of immigration; it is the result of a range of complex situations in the community. We all recognized that the public library has a vested interest in a literate population and also has the ability to do something about it. We have been doing it for three years and growing every day.

Once again, and very vividly with the Campaign, public libraries are demonstrating that they are centers for learning, that they open doors to informaiton, that they break barriers to access as surely as they did for the disabled, the underserved, minorities, children, the aged among others.

We can be proud of the large numbers of learners that we have succeeded in reaching. This program is still young, and we have documented evidence that our adult learners are being satisfied by the services that we provide. We have steadfastly supported our adult learners and have helped them become active and involved in the Campaign's programs and in their communties.

We have found new friends in the local and state partnerships which have focussed new eyes upon libraries and leaders, with broad agendas. These new relationships have opened up new possiblities for all of us. We have figured out ways to get things done, using our resources and operating in new ways that we did not have an inkling about three years ago. And, we are testing and modifying all of the time.

The Campaign has been committed to local control, local decision-making, and local diagnosis of what services are right for a given community. That focus has been maintained, and it is not typical of most

state funded programs. This committment, I believe, signifies a shared responsiblity by state and local government in facing this challenge.

While the Campaign got off to a fast start and became a major movement not only because of the state money, but because it could depend on the established infrastructure of the public library in California, building on staff skills, their technical and public services, their communications systems, and their cooperative activities already in place.

Each of us here probably have been reflecting on what we have learned, what we have experienced in the Campaign, and what it has meant to each of us personally. For me, it has been an exhilerating exprience. I will never forget the first attempts to interest the Legislature in our cause only to have key legislators look at me and ask, "why?". I recall the doubt expressed by some of my own staff, and yes, by some of you in this room tonight. A meeting with the editorial staff of a radio station in Los Angeles early in the Campaign particularly comes to mind. After we had made a variety of presentations, several of the editorial team expressed doubt that there was a problem. And, it seems that some of the media and certainly some government leaders, particularly at the federal level still are expressing doubt.

But, going to various community forums, meeting with learners and tutors is a constant reinforcement for me. To listen, to hear the testimonials has been exhilerating. It confirms for me that the reason the California Literacy Campaing makes sense is the same reasons public library service makes sense. The Campaingn directly helps people, both learners and tutors, and it is built on the remarkable creative energy of us all who have been attracted to work in it.

Of course, the Campaign presents challenges, and there are problems and issues that need to be tackled. We are here as our own best "think tank," and I am convinced that in this room is all the knowlege and experience that we need for discussion. One thing I have learned, is that we are out front. Few others are at the point of development that we are.

I hope that each of us achieve much from our time here together. I know that there are at least forty-six different points of view, and probably over

100 different priorities. This is our chance -- let us not hold back from saying what is on our minds, otherwise we will not be able to clearly look at our options and our expectations and think about where the individual programs and the whole Campaign wants to be or what we want it to look like a few years from now.

In her remarks for me, Barbara Bush says, "I chose literacy as my major project not just because of my love for books, but because I was convinced that all our most pressing problems -- as individuals and as a nation -- would be lessened if more people could read and write well. Eight years and many sobering experiences later, I am more convinced than ever that literacy is the master key to living a better life in today's world -- as a worker, a parent, and a truly enfranchised citizen."

I hope each of us will leave this Retreat with a sense that we have been able to think things through, that we have learned something, and that we feel strengthened. I look forward to all of us finally getting to know each other and I know that is what you want also.

III. THE PURPOSE AND VISION OF THE C. L. C.

In his second address titled "The Purpose and Vision of the California Literacy Campaign", which set the tone for the retreat's first small-group work, the State Librarian reiterated the philosophy of CLC and the public library's role in combatting illiteracy. He acknowledged that future funding was a major issue of all and asked participants to "talk about what we each mean when we ask: 'Will there be on-going funding for existing programs?'" He suggested that "local funding" and "local fundraising" are two different issues.

The State Librarian also asked small groups to consider these major issues:

--how adult literacy services are becoming a part of public library services;
--how programs are managed within the libraries and in the context of forseeably constant growth; and
--library literacy projects' relationships with each other and others.

He concluded with a personal expectation for the retreat: "...that by Friday noon, we will be clearer on where we're going and how we will get there."

Participants' Expectations

Participants were divided into four groups for small-group work, based on their positions in local library programs: ccordinators (divided into two groups), supervisors and library directors. (See Appendix for group assignments of state staff and board participants.) Each group had an outside facilitator/recorder team. As much as possible, all groups were facilitated identically.

The first task for participants was to share their personal expectations for the retreat. The most often mentioned subjects, by group, beginning with the most frequently mentioned, (number of times mentioned in parentheses) were:

COORDINATORS' Expectations:
- Funding (14)
- Learn from/about other programs (14)
- Clarification of roles--of coordinator, library director and state and state consultants (10)

Networking (9)
How to improve/enlarge service (9)
What ARE priority issues (7)
Integration of literacy into library program (5)
How/what are we teaching (5)

SUPERVISORS' Expectations:

Funding (10)
How to expanding/improve services (7)
How to work with/convince others of CLC's worth (especially library staff and board, local government and leaders) (5)
Integration of literacy into library program (3)

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' EXPECTATIONS:

Funding (17)
How to work with/convince others of CLC's worth (especially library board, local politicians, council, business and educational communities, coun cils, business and educational communities, county) (10)
How to sustain/improve local program (10)
Learn from/about other programs (6)
Integration of literacy into library program (5)
Plan for/vision of the future (4)

As the State Librarian correctly reasoned, funding was, indeed, an issue on everyone's mind. Note that two other issues were frequently mentioned in all groups: How to expand/improve/enlarge local program/services and integration of literacy into library programs.

Since they have closest daily contact with the target populations, it was not surprising that coordinators would be looking for practical, already-proven techniques and activities and for networking opportunities more than others. Both coordinators and library directors were looking for direction and options for the future.

Small group discussion of CLC's purpose and vision included:

--questions and comments about the State Librarian's address (which were recorded on newsprint and immediately shared with him, so that he could address some of them in his closing comments the next day) and
--discussion of three questions posed by the State Librarian, dealing with learner-centered objectives, coalitions and methodology.

The subjects mentioned most often in participants' comments and questions directed to the State Librarian (beginning with the most frequently-mentioned) included:

Funding
Relationships with schools, including high schools and adult basic education
Coalition/community-awareness building
Libraries not presently in CLC
Fund-raising
Integration of literacy into library programs/services

NOTE: There was a tremendous diversity in how the questions and comments were stated, making this summary especially difficult. Readers are invited to inspect the entire, unedited list of comments and questions (see Appendix at end of this chapter) and draw their own summaries and conclusions.

Three-Question Check of Shared Understanding

Three questions were posed to all groups in an effort to better understand what the participants' shared purpose and vision of the California Literacy Campaign is. Since numerous participants expressed to the evaluator their frustration at not being able to be in all small groups at once, thereby missing out on much of the retreat discussion, answers to the questions are included in this section in their unedited entirety. The responses have been left according to group, so that the reader can compare what library directors said with what coordinators were thinking, and so on.

(NOTE: In many cases the library is mentioned, while in others the name of the library is not. This depended entirely upon what each group and its participants chose to do. If a participant did mention the name of the library, it is included here, to make it easier for readers to follow up on items of particular interest or need.)

1. HOW WELL ARE ADULT LEARNER-CENTERED OBJECTIVES WORKING?

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' Responses:

Starts out well, but later staff discovers adult can't define objectives. Need to help staff work with adult learner to define real objectives.

Very careful interviewing of adult and volunteer to match teams--greater success.

When student drops out, so does tutor. Must keep tutor sold on program even if student drops out.

A man tutor and a male student doesn't work as well as a mix.

After match, it's important to redefine with learner the objectives.

Students do not report that objectives are being set.

It's difficult to sell the self-directed concept to boards, commissions--doesn't lend itself to clear statistics.

You can use students to help convince boards of program's value.

A shift from quantitative to qualitative role.

Overall, yes, it's working.

SUPERVISORS' responses:

Some presssure from library board and program itself to have measureable objectives.

Is this a real issue for all?

Others understand grade level, staff measures on how well individuals feel they are doing.

With time now, wish we were more focussed on the grade level==need to put together and rethink some.

Our learner objective goal works well for us--for outside we use the Laubach method certificate mark (based on self-testing materials)--satisfy both; call them graduates, count them, let them continue.

Have PIC contract (JTPA) - Strong emphasis on grade and speed of progression--dangerous situation--emphasis on achievement and timeline.

GAIN program clients told "go here and learn to read in weeks". PROBLEM Statewide trying to coach social workers on how people do learn to read. Problem of financial incentives.

Students come fearful of tests, DON'T want to be tested.

Also use Laubach for those who want level--lots depends on staff make-up--we have no reading specialist--can't judge. Still feel a lack in area of learner evaluation.

Proposal in works to provide support in measurement of learner impact--need to describe what's happening--RFP going to all local programs.

COORDINATORS' **responses:**

How do we evaluate what we're doing--so it's not just numbers but SERVICE. And how do we get that information to use?

Need overall direction from State as to how to evaluate

Want to know thinking at State level NOW re: evaluating and opportunity to share the problem

Evaluation of this is SUBJECTIVE

Learner's objectives aren't always realistic and usually change as they progress in program

Gives learner sense of control and raised self-esteem

Learners not always sure what they want or what the possibilities are

Learner-centered objectives are hard to quantify and measure

Tutors need to be aware of Learner's direction and use skill books for measurement

People usually drop out for personal reasons, not program failure--involves things libraries hve no control over

It IS working--learners feel very safe...tests mean failure syndrome

You don't need to be at a certain grade level to be functionally literate--to transfer reading to real world.

NO evaluation mandate from the state is wanted.

Students have mandated curriculum (Fresno) (GAIN) (Dept. of Social Services).

Working fine: testing, working with TUTOR to understand.

Working well (Siskiyou).
Tutors work with learners with goals first.

No formal assessment.

Formal evaluation with reading specialist; determine independent reading level; ASK learner their objectives;

post-test--show grade level improvement.

Exciting--can improve.

Interest in competency and achieving goals, not grade.

On target: built in IDENTIFICATION to help determine goals, evaluate to see how set goals.

Geared to what is important to student.

Has competency based assessment to key in goals--but flexible for what motivates student.

More training with tutors needed to help learn how to set goals.

Tailor lessons to student's goal.

The more you use goals and objectives, the better standard evaluation (vs competency level).

Concern--how do you say that the person getting a better job is due to CLC? need to have measurable results to justify the program.

Structure 2/3 time on skills, 1/3 time on student goals.

Question for Gary: To what extent do you feel you sell legislature on anything but grade level competency evaluation?

2. COALITION-BUILDING--HOW FAR ALONG IS IT? WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' responses:

Fresno County: good network, integration with school programs, Chamber of Commerce involvement.

Literacy Coalition = library and other providers.

Task Force--with TV networks.

Total dollar value being put into program in-kind.

Need: to expand to other communities.

LA County: Toll-free number developing network of sources and taking burden off main library.

South San Francisco: Contract with County Librarian to provide services.

San Diego County: San Diego Literacy Coalition initiated by Chairman of Board of Supervisers--included judges, educators, journalists, Chamber--money to be distributed in grants to providers--working members of Campaign offer technical assistance.

San Mateo City: Local adult school provides tutor training at no cost. Good working relationship with other literacy programs. Need: How to get advisory council going?

Oakland: Newspapers are natural ally for funding literacy programs.

Shasta County: Literacy program is a basis for applying for money from GAIN, PIC and county jails. Using PLATO (computer) software

Riverside: Advisory committee and PLUS group; referrals between adult education programs in schools and libraries--but school district people don't attend meetings

Library has invited Department of Education speaker (Dr. Lynda Smith) to talk about need to cooperate with libraries.

SUPERVISORS' responses:

Two kinds in LA:
1) all literacy providers and support groups
2) also individual contacts--school systems, businesses, etc.

Coalitions
1. "What library is doing" meetings
2. common purpose
3. common purpose and ACTIVE alliance

Recently began Literacy Council
first meeting gave nitty gritty info
second meeting underground grassroots plan

Adult schools pay for training with us

Ventura adult ed pays for reading specialist salaries at some sites, sheriffs pay at jail site, also trial with Calif. Conservation Corps

Business agent from local union approached them, union/employer problems, wanted help teaching--have grant and local community college support

in Los Angeles:Downtown Y provides space
Local business college gave money and volunteers
Prison program

Advisor from ABE meet with coordinators
Substance Abuse Director took training--patients help each other and materials underwritten
Herald Examiner News 40% production people are illiterate--develop program with us for them and families

Local newspaper (Contra Costa) time OFF for employees for onsite training, ads in paper for tutors and training, twice-weekly column for "Savvy Reader", work with Business Council, take over annual tutor recognition party and make it a fundraiser.

One articulate student helped with this (above)--boost impact of adult learners speaking out

LA County Foundation--fundraising help and use some of the "Friends" groups

"Challenge Day" in community helpful--what is undone, police chief offered neighborhood watch circuit help

COORDINATORS' responses:

Santa Clara and 3 1/2 other counties are working together as a result of the PLUS--but still need corporate ihvolvement

Modoc--as a result of PLUS every agency shares referrals and resources except money

PLUS has enabled coalitions

Literacy programs now being recognized as viable

Need to make coalitions with groups who are pipelines to hard-to-reach

Feelings of competitiveness with Adult Ed, community colleges and volunteer groups who need to buy resources in some areas

Need to clarify service goals between coalitions--stay clear on what primary goals are e.g. literacy vs job goals programs

Need local recognition, i.e. city council, other agencies in order to get more resources

People from different agencies come with own, often conflicting goals

Strong--joint sponsored programs--"task force"

Working to convince adult education people that volunteers are qualified

Network of providers in San Diego--technical, S.D. Council or library fundraising

Difference between LITERACY providers--easier to get literacy providers in coalition than community leaders

PLUS helpful in Orange County

School, PIC, CLC, city working together in Commerce

(hope with adult education) very coordinated--sympathize with ability to blow off--doesn't hurt to volunteer as community aid in adult ed (Watsonville)

Personal contacts important--easier in rural than urban--networking sheriff, probation, criminal justice has money

Obstacles to coalition (all community sector) DEPENDS on 1) size, 2) time coordinator has 3)ability to reach

Divide 2 labels:
coalition
literacy providers (Fresno)

all else: business (ask to do one thing)
media
agencies

To organize literacy coalition--primary are of CLC to strength--on their terms, to share

CLC networking function: CLC single spokesperson

Get library directors to know coordinators can't do all roles

Only been service providers network to get so much done

How many have formal meetings of coalitions--alliance, community leaders? 10 do, 8 don't

Literacy conference helped!!

3. HOW IS IT WORKING TO LEAVE THE TEACHING METHODOLOGY UP TO THE LOCAL LIBRARY? HOW WELL IS YOUR METHODOLOGY WORKING?

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' responses:

Local determination approved by library directors

New methodology coming from GAIN with required curriculum will be a problem

Difficult to share methodology with other members of coalition--helpful to put example of all different teaching methods in manual to give to new providers

Important to be able to use all local people and programs--those acknowledged in community should be used

Important to be identified with national campaign and national publicity

SUPERVISORS' responses:

IT WORKS! VERY WELL!

Have changed and "re-vitalized" LWR method, use some LVA techniques, some other, minor conflict here

Advantage of above flexibility for meeting the individual needs of community and individual

Couldn't afford LWR so tried to change--hired reading specialist for own method--some problems with this

At training session on "student goals" should put in LIBRARY as a resource for them to help students. Bring sample books, etc. Also, how to take students to library (Contra Costa)

COORDINATORS' responses:

like latitude--KEEP IT LOCAL & AUTONOMOUS

conflicts with educational community questionning library's methodology

Diverse methodologies have impact on determining effectiveness/evaluation

Diverse staffing--different backgrounds

Like flexibility in local system

Always looking for ways to improve

Measure by: retention of tutors and students; staff/student feedback

Vary methods according to learners

Librarians have used proven curriculum

Many tutor training programs don't deal with learning disabilities, different learning styles

Local autonomy is critical in being able to constantly adapt and find what works

Use of coalitions to handle special cases

Working fine--keep methodology at the local level (concensus of this group)

Local control and feedback

Can't handle increasing of learning disabilities

Method...needs to go to tutor level

Lots of complaints with mandated curriculum

New materials needed to supplement Laubach

Having option helpful

Laubach useful for tutor

Needs to be up to local project and community

Difficult to say method is meeting learner needs because goals are constantly changing

Difficult for learners to communicate learning goals (people's goals change)

Important to have structured methodology..if build in learner goals--helpful--

Tutors need to be trained to grow with learner
need sense of success

Timeline evaluation is important

THE PURPOSE AND VISION OF THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAGIN

California Literacy Campaign Retreat
Asilomar, California
February 26, 1987

Gary E. Strong
State Librarian of California

My purpose this morning is to share a bit of the philosophy of the California Literacy Campaign and to describe, insofar as posible, some of the facts about its operation. As I indicated last evening, the public library has a specific role in advancing literacy, and in representing and demonstrating the benefits of a literate society.

Libraries alone cannot cure the problem of illitearcy, nor can it be expected that the problem will go away soon. We are in this for the long haul, and I view the public library role, like that of the State Library, as a permanent one. It may not be a fixed one, or the same in every community through every branch library, but the Campaign has always envisioned a strong role for the public library in meeting its over-all objectives and mission.

We hope that formal education agencies find more and different ways to address the issue. There are certain conditions in society that contribute to illiteracy change, but no one agency can do it all. The Campaign as always stressed the development of local and statewide partnerships through coalition with a variety of groups and organizations.

The standards for a literate population of yesterday cannot be the standards of tomorrow. California's society and economy has changed. Its technological requirements will necessitate higher levels of literacy in the workplace and in our personal lives in general. The inability to read and write is a profound obstacle in life. Libraries have helped to remove this barrier for thousands of people. Historically libraries have sought out the underserved and targeted services to them -- the isolated, the handicapped, the non-English speaking.

The Campaign is also embedded in the long public library tradition of non-judgmental service that responds to the user on his or her individual terms, not terms prescribed by an institution. This is very

powerful, and it is especially significant for new readers, whose self-conficence is newly experienced, and whose past experience with some systems of education have been negative. New readers now have the chance to make more informed decisions. Gaining control over what they want to know, and how to get hold of it ... access it ... is a powerful tool for all their lives.

These rationales for why the Campaign is located in the public library in local communities and neighborhoods are very important for us all to be clear about, whether we are librarians, or other professionals working on the Campaign. I would like to observe how much talent and diverse expertise the State Library and the public libraries have acquired from the Campaign. It is important that the library role in adult literacy is clear as well when we are talking to local and state government.

Let me turn for a moment to share a number of truths concerning our efforts. I need hardly to stress that there are many players in the Campaign. Those of us here represent only the core critical staff in the libraries. Not included are the many of the CLC staff assistants in libraries, let alone the adult learners, tutors, and other volunteers. For some of us literacy work is a fulltime job ... for others, a parttime responsiblity ... for plenty of us the Literacy Campaign is only one thing on our plate.

There are all of the other colleagues upon which we depend, staff from service agencies, industry, the schools, government officials, and more. These colleagues and partners have their own priorities as well. I imagine that each one of us here has been in a situation of potential conflict. Sometimes all we can do is agree to deisagree at the moment while we try to pursue our mission of a literate population. I think we are all getting plenty of practice in how to define our roles so that we mesh with others.

The State Library experience parallels this. I have a lot of other issues. Some of my staff is dedicated to the Campaign, others have parttime responsibility with other assignments just as pressing. But we are all accountable -- you to your local officials and communities. The State Library is accountable to state government and the legislature. We all just have to face the fact of reporting, gathering of statistics and other data, because we

must be able to defend and justify what the Campaign does.

The State Library technical assistance role is important. One role that many of the State Library staff have is to ensure that the information is generated and published on a regular basis.

Another role is our partnership with local libraries and programs. I regard this partnership as a mutual exploration of issues that need to be tackled and resolved. For that the State Library is here to help with its resources, its contacts and referrals, and its staff expertise. Some of that technical assistance is provided by staff dedicated full time to the Campaign, other is provided by staff, such as the regional consultants and Cameron, who work full time on a range of library development and funding issues.

The most expertise for literacy service is at the local level, where you know your own situations and capabilities best. However, what makes sense at the local level sometimes appears contradictory to the general direction of the statewide Campaign as it has evolved. It is important that library programs in the Campaign stand on their own apart and distinct from but cooperating fully with other literacy programs. When there are differences of opinion, we must work together to see how local and state interests fit together.

Last night I noted the commitment of the California Literacy Campaign to local control and the shared responsibility of local government. Locally you have the best sense of the political realities there ... how to gain the majority of your local boards. You have far more intimate contact with them than the 120 legislators and the blue pencil in Sacramento.

I know that future funding of your programs is a major issue. I will be willing to support an attempt at longer-range state funding than is now projected, but not at the 100 per cent establishment level provided during the second and third years of the five year program. I believe that local flexibility cannot be maintained in a context of 100 per cent state support. This is not a block grant program. These are categorical services and if the state pays, the state, sooner or later, controls.

If all funding for the California Literacy Campaign comes from the State, the entire program is subject to changing political and economic circumstances as perceived in Sacramento. This means the whole program is at risk each and every year. It is much stronger if local commitments are won; if sources of support are diversified. Success at getting local funding is purssuasive to legislators as well.

During our group work, we have got to talk about what we each mean when we ask: "will there be on-gong funding for existing programs?" I know that you are asking "How realistic is local funding?" What are the programmatic implications of a shift in funding from state to local resources? I would anticipate that local funding and local fundraising, are two different issues. I would also anticipate that we do not all want to talk money to the exclusion of every other issue. We have attempted to structure the topics for group discussion to enable us to address, therefore, a number of such issues.

Another issue that we need to discuss is how adult literacy services are becoming a part of public library services. Both you, and the state Library, are facing growing CLC programs. We are on a cycle of popularity and filling a need that can now hardly be contained. It is sometimes especially challenging when CLC programs feel like tails wagging dogs. I have been in the front on the Campaign the whole three years, I have wanted to be. I believe in it and I too must be mindful of what the rest of the State Library and its staff are achieving, and how the CLC fits into the State Library's goals and mission.

How the programs are managed within the libraries and in the context of forseeably constant growth, is a major challenge for discussion, as is our relationships with others. Our partnerships, our inter-regional contacts, our individualism and our statewide identiy are issues we must address.

I hope that by Friday noon, that we will be clearer on where we're going and how we will get there. I hope that we will take the opportunity to freely and thoroughly discuss and work with the issues that we decide are key to us. On the one hand, we all want stability, reliability and continuity; on the other hand we embrace the evolutionary creative quality of the Campaign.

THURSDAY SMALL GROUPS

Library Directors--Toyon (red dot on name tags) plus Gary Strong (State Library)
Supervisors--Acacia (blue dot on name tags) plus Al Bennett and Paul Kiley (State Lib.)
Coordinators: divided into two groups below

Coordinators Group I (yellow dot)

Yarrow

Elsaas

Jones

Talan

Sommer

Pleasnick

Osbey

Marrero

MacDonald

Wilczak

Halverson

Williams

Saed

Johnson, Victoria

Pastori

Christian

Bowse

Gamble

Okamoto

Gray

Mallory

Shelton

Host

Malek

Percy (State Library)

Kirkland (State Library)

Ruby (State Library)

CLSB Members:

- Clark
- Morris
- Davis

Coordinators Group II (green dot)

Jefferis

Richard

Reta

Alger

Wilson

Conss

Stewart

Johnson, Suzanne

Valdez

Tanioka

Quinonez

Cruz

Fleming

Ammer

Sorrentino

Jones

Carlisle

Vivrette

Newkirt

Aguirre

Reynolds

Torbett

Pedulla

Amend (State Library)

Cuesta (State Library)

Henson (State LIbrary)

Robertson (State Library)

CLSB Members:

- King
- Logan
- Stevenson

FRIDAY A.M. SMALL GROUPS

Small groups have been chosen at random with library teams participating in the same group. Listed below are the library teams for each of the groups and where they will meet:

Group A--Toyon

Alameda County Library
Carlsbad City Library
Eureka-Humboldt County Library
Kern County Library
Marin County Free Library
Modoc County Library
Oakland Public Library
Richmond Public Library
San Bernardino County Library
San Mateo Public Library
Shasta County Library
Ventura County Library Services Agency

Group B--Acacia

Alameda Free Library
Commerce Public Library
Fresno County Free Library
Long Beach Public Library
Mendocino County Library
(Monterey Park) Bruggemeyer Memorial Library
Palm Springs Public Library
Riverside Public Library--La Sierra Branch
San Diego County Library
Santa Ana Public Library
Siskiyou County Library
Watsonville Public Library

Group C--Viewpoint West

Auburn-Placer County Library
Contra Costa County Library
Hemet Public Library
Los Angeles County Public Library
Menlo Park Public Library
Napa City-County Library
Pasadena Public Library
Sacramento Public Library--Del Paso Heights Branch
San Francisco Public Library
Santa Clara Co. Free Library--Milpitas Branch
South San Francisco/Daly City
Woodland Public Library

Group D--Viewpoint East

Butte County Library
Downey City Library
Imperial County Free Library
Los Angeles Public Library
Merced County Library
National City Public Library
Placentia Library District
Salinas Public Library
San Luis Obispo City-County Library
(Santa Paula) Blanchard Community Library
Stockton/San Joaquin County Public Library

FRIDAY A.M. SMALL GROUPS

STATE BOARD AND STATE LIBRARY STAFF

GROUP A--TOYON

State Library Staff:
Bennett
Cuesta
Henson

State Board:
King

GROUP B--ACACIA

State Board:
Davis
Morris
Stevenson

GROUP C VIEWPOINT WEST

State Library Staff:
Kirkland
Robertson
Ruby

State Board:
Logan

GROUP D--VIEWPOINT EAST

State Library Staff:
Amend
Kiley
Percy

Appendix III-c

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ADDRESSED TO THE STATE LIBRARIAN

Coordinators Questions and Comments

How possible is it to make CLC a part of the regular library services when ALL part of budget are being cut?

Shouldn't we be working with school boards on local level, i.e. high school requests for tutors, combination of funding--schools and libraries?

Address relationship between schools, H.S., including Adult Ed, and CLC

Reality vs. the Dream --recognize local issues & funding

In joint funding and coalitions, WHO controls program, owns resources, make rules?

We're after functional literacy, not reading

Liked comments on diversification needs re: funding-locally want concrete direction--How do you raise $?...get buy-in from business?

Don't expect significant changes in learners in short term--takes a long term(20 yrs. minimum)

Impact of educational system--need more emphasis on state level

Education budget cuts
How much can we expect from state education system?

What we can do in 2-3 years isn't enough

Lack of $ support from county

Literacy needs to be a NATIONAL ISSUE

No just a numbers game--look at QUALITY, human element

Larger issue of designing libraries and systems to meet needs of people NOW as opposed to 3 decades ago

Local funding is NOT a defense against vanishing program

Enjoyed, set at ease because of commitment to funding "reassured by Gary"

Good explanation--would like copy of what he said about total commitment of state; excellent speech

Just because of PUSH for funding not necessarily going to get it

Need backing of Librarians-- directors and staff--to effectively lobby

Adult learner under-served

Need to EDUCATE all librarians that are not in CLC

Is the library making efforts to pull in (ESL) non-English speaking?

How do we need to evaluate new libraries in the CLC program? (How do we bring in new libraries)

Why do we really want to bring in (more) new libraries into the programs now?

Could we use $ for expanding boundaries?

Can some of the existing programs that were "underfunded" be refunded: given more money.

To what extent do you feel you can SELL the legislature on anything but grade level competency evaluation? (This question came up when we were discussing learner centered objectives this am).

Is it realistic to expect the coordinators to work in so many different roles (administrators, trainers, fundraising, coalition builders, P.R. etc)

We're in different spots in terms of integration and local support--we have to support each other and develop a structure to do so.

We have a role to raise community awareness.

We have been working on literacy since before 1984--broaden our awareness to incorporate our other literacy work

Explore creating CLC Foundation to do PR and fundraising

We must separate ESL from CLC

One of the reasons we can't codify this--some communities have many opportunities for ESL-some have none

Opportunity to talk about many library programs--bring public attention to all through publicity from CLC

CLC is something that is do-able

Publicity from state level really helps

Need to know what people (who are here) mean by integration

Libraries seem to be able to tackle the problem better than schools--don't become too involved with schools!

If we design program on volunteer basis, we have better chance to raise necessary funds

Quality of PR legitimizes what we are doing--state really helps

Library Directors' Questions and Comments

How do we involve the educational community?

When is the time to go for longer-range funding and some idea on state/local mix

Do we have relationship with Welfare Dept and GAIN?

What is role of CSL with raising funds from large corporations?

How appropriate is it for literacy training to be done in the library?

What will the new standard of literacy be--how does it change program?

How do we convince comminity this is a problem we can do something about?

Supervisors' Questions and Coments

More about continued funding at the state level--"What do you mean?" How much, how real, etc...

Accountability "what happens if we can't meet our own funding formula?"

Does the group understand and agree with the explanation re: state funding, state control, program cuts, etc?

- local library program not now being fully funded by state
- state vs. local--how much safer is local--compete with fire, police; concern about attitudes at local level

Positives: 3 year full funding and good push from state

Our extra time has been helpful--Proven

Need more short range/long range plan of what role state will take re publicity

Mayor stated at election time he was glad literacy was on his side!

Are these services considered essential? Some feel library is an "extra"

IV. SHARED EXPERIENCES AND LEARNINGS

The second major small-group task was for participants to share what they had learned from their involvement in the California Literacy Campaign. This time the groups did not follow identical procedures. The library directors again reported by library. The supervisors listed their learnings, then voted on which ones to report back to the large group (their choices are in all capital letters), while the coordinators apparently just listed their learnings. Again the reader should note WHO says what, in order to better interpret each comment.

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' Responses

Long Beach: Benefit: to assist us in identifying adult illiterates

Downey: Increased visibility in community through leadership in CLC

Siskiyou County: Library must move out of prime mover role and into partnership role

Modoc: There are more people out there who need us than I dreamed.

Merced: There are areas in the county that do not have ESL--areas of need.

San Diego County: Shows us a whole new way for libraries to be part of the educational system

South San Francisco: It's the most successful user-based program we offer--and the community sees it.

Riverside: Amazed at amount of public support--greater than ever seen before

Woodland: Literacy supporters helped win building election integrated with educational community through community college and adult education

Hemet: Reinforced concept of library as educational institution in broad sense

Fresno County: Another opportunity to weave library into broader fabric of community

Imperial County: Gotten increased visibility--helped county know we have a problem with illiteracy

Watsonville: Students have given the library credit for success

Kern: Given a focus--let county know we have a purpose

San Mateo City: Personal level--greater understanding of problem of illiteracy; outreach has increased visibility

Mendocino County: Realized its a real problem and as a result the community has recognized it

Santa Ana: Both in Sacramento and Santa Ana have learned transition from startup small focus to larger organization is difficult; personal testimonials are super for selling anything to funding sources

Contra Costa County: Discovered need far surpassed expectations and public support has been tremendous

San Luis Obispo: Learned issues are more complex than hoped for and is difficult to get to the learners

Placentia: Essential for community and library world to support the program--library should provide building, support and encouragement

Carlsbad: Tutors have learned that adult learners are dealing with many other social problems--implications for training of tutors

Shasta County: Helped library be identified as a learning center; opportunity to experiment with publicity and make the library more visible in the community

Place County: Difficult to find learners, have had great success finding volunteers

San Bernardino County: Just beginning to understand the problem; has made it easier to integrate with county agencies; has helped library be seen as other than a place for women and children by the community

Butte: Given opportunity to give volunteer supporters something else to do than housekeeping items

Pasadena: Amazed at volume and degree of commitment of volunteers to the program

Alameda City: Increased visibility and good working relationship wit adult school has occurred

Oakland: Really perceived as an idea whose time has come; seen as a win-win by political bodies, staff and community with library in the lead role

National City: Library has taken a leadership role in helping take care of community social problem--recognized by Council; problem is greter than anticipated

Richmond: Library needs to continue to seek ways to meet people's basic needs

Los Angeles County: Brought more minority users into library; change from volunteer learner to forced (GAIN); learner is a concern

California State Library: Principles used in this program can apply to other programs--need to find ways to use them elsewhere; network of libraries has responded well;libraries are adaptable

Stockton/San Joaquin: Hope that process will take us back to libraries; concentrating on reading advisory role--get rid of computers except for clerical work

State Library: To learn patience and yet be able to respond when things happen very, very quickly (like overnight)

Alameda County: Learned that people all around me cannot read (personal observation)

Marin County: Didn't apply for a big enough grant

Santa Clara County: Provides common cause to work on with industry

Humboldt County: When students "go public", they confer great status on the library

Santa Paula: If we can secure money, we can target underserved group; some question why providing literacy services instead of basic services; feeling of partnerships with other providers helps sell to community; changes to signage [?] and being conscious of how people use library

Menlo Park: Raised profile of library; library is more than a place to get books and tax forms; touched people in personal ways

SUPERVISORS' Responses

What other programs are doing

POLITICS PLAYS BIGGER ROLE IN FUNDING PROGRAMS THAN INSTRINSIC VALUE OF PROGRAM.

Community support exists--hard to find and measure

PROGRAM MUST BE INTEGRATED--NOT APPENDED

Within and without people question if this is proper role for the library

In order to change and grow--one needs patience, tenacity and endurance

Model for other volunteer programs the library could do

NEEDS SUPPORT FROM TOP-LEVEL MANAGEMENT

Learned how to work with volunteers and the importance of volunteer recognition (cups, party-tv, newsletter-tutors)

SUCCESS OF CLC IS BASED ON STATEWIDE EFFORT

USING THE MEDIA

People who need tutoring DO come forward when they hear of us.

Students view library as safe place

Both learners and tutors become good library patrons

Above not true in all cases

To make them patrons, must provide appropriate level materials

Insert message in audio-visual materials--"Help a friend learn to read. Call _____."

RESPECT for non-readers and the coping they must do

No true stereotype of non-reader

Relationship develops beyond student learner--"give and take"

Labor intensive job for coordinators/staff with students and tutors

Which groups support literacy and why? Some naturals don't.

This is is popular issue now but must worry now about 5 years from now.

VERBAL SUPPORT AT ALL LEVELS IS MUCH EASIER TO GET THAN FINANCIAL.

Verbal support also easier to get than "time or inkind" support

Measure program success by increased self-esteem of learners

Need COMMON, FIRM arguments for why this program is in the library (common and statewide)

Individual fundraising not solution

Be realistic--no miracles

Media commitment strong when they know why they are doing it

CONFIRMATION OF PUBLIC LIBRARY ROLE IN EDUCATION AS AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

No free lunch--walk around animal and look underneath--be sure you know up front what the strings attached are

NOTE: items in all capital letters above were ones reported out in large session re what was learned (by group vote)

COORDINATORS' Responses

Learned as CSLS Board--more today than even before on CLC [comment]of CLSB member assigned to coordinators group]

How useful and important NETWORKING is

The more "learner focused and involved", the more successful

Becoming education issue: feel every county should have a literacy program

First time involved in something that touches everyone

NEWSPAPER more cooperative after positive letter from coordinator regarding paper's support of literacy

Literacy is a human and political issue--need to learn how to deal with both

Emphasize to newspapers audience development activities [?]

Use paper, for example, Learn to Read Lesson plans in paper to implement programs [supplement]?

How important for media coverage centralized--toll free phone number on tv, in newspapers

Really appreciate local CONTROL and maximize regional coordination

Be good listener and good counselor to tutor

Never to lose focus that we are the library

Strong connection with library services

Learners important part of orientation

Can't do all by ourselves--library perfectly willing to share with others

Identify who will work for you (e.g. college students, mutual benefits

Very important to maintain contact with tutors, students

How difficult to be learner centered

Courage and desire of students and the desire of volunteers to help

Hard to convince people we have a literacy problem

Learned this is a process--never-ending

ESL factor is visible--need to move beyond

People are not aware of the extent of literacy problems: stereotyping problems

We have done a lot to persuade public--show successful learners

It's impossible for a library program to solve this problem alone. Solution: many different groups develop programs of their own for their own neighborhood.

Six months is too short a time to do anything involving the government

Continual need to see forest, not just trees

Encouraging community-based learning centers is not that easy

Warn tutors of drop-out rate; don't take it personally

Libraries need to provide other programs and services to support the learners

Preliterate students are difficult to work with; rate of change depends of learner's level

Real beneficiaries will be the next generation

Adult-learner process can be personally alienating for the learning---they need a support system

Pay attention to tutor's expectations and feelings of success and self-judgement--and judgement of student. Help them develop reasonable personal expectations and understand the "helping" role.

One-to-one tutoring is labor intensive and creates "treadmill" feeling rather than one of progress

Need to create support systems to meet this need (above)

Unless education becomes a basic important value, we'll continue to have a big problem.

Until literacy is a matter of public policy, we're operating in a void.

Literacy is a saleable product--there's an emotional hook.

Voluntarism in literacy is unique--in the volunteer world--a lot of emotional giving and taking.

One program's goal: "To make a difference!"

Can't do all one would like to do--need to draw on others' expertise.

What began as a cause now needs to be run as a business.

It's hard to grow and still keep doing it well.

Quantity vs quality of service.

V. IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITY ISSUES AND OPTIONS

On Thursday afternoon the participants, still in their groupings of coordinators, library directors and supervisors, were asked to turn their attention to the major issues of the California Literacy Campaign. After brainstorming issues, each group rank ordered the issues they had identified, until they had reached a consensus on "five key issues that are central to the California Literacy Campaign".

Once the priority issues had been identified, each group worked to develop possible options for dealing with the issues. Consensus was not sought for the options. The groups arrived at their options in small groups within the small groups. While some participants had the opportunity to work on options for issues in which they had a special interest or concern, others were assigned by simply counting off in the group.

Following is a report of the priority issues identified, listed again by group, plus the options suggested by the group. (It is suggested that each reader look at the entire brainstormed list of options, listed in the Appendix, and perhaps discuss them with tutors, students and others from one's local literacy project or coalition.)

SUPERVISORS' Priority Issues and Possible Options

Issue: **OBTAIN SECURE FUNDING**
Options:

- Pick up fundable piece of the program on a local level
- Continue state funding of existing programs at current level
- Get other local agencies or programs to pick up funding of portions of the literacy program (ABE, Sheriff)
- Raise money to set up an endowment with interest large enough to support the program

Issue: **INTEGRATE LITERACY PROGRAM INTO REGULAR LIBRARY SERVICES**
Options:

- Literacy coordinator will become a member of the regular library staff "family
- Library director will be fully committed to the literacy program

Literacy program will follow the daily working procedures of the library

Authorizing jurisdiction to officially include literacy program as part of the organizational structure of the library

Issue: **EVALUATE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS**
Options:

Develop a measurement tool to asess the quality of the service at the local level

The State Library should hire a consulting firm to evaluate the effectiveness of all state-funded literacy programs

(NOTE: In his third speech of the retreat, the State Librarian noted that the State Library had recently issued a request for proposals for a Learner Progress Evaluation Project. This will be an attempt to do what few literacy projects have dared--to take an indepth look at non-standard indicators of learner progress. This should become or enable a major tool with which "learner-centered" projects can measure their effectiveness.)

Issue: **DEVELOP A LONG RANGE PLAN**
Options:

LOCAL: set up strategic planning committee: members of literacy coalition, learner, tutor, supervising librarian, literacy coordinator and library director

planning committee to:
- establish time line
- evaluate current program
- develop goals and objectives
- determine cost of programs and develop option and alternatives

draft initial document

director solicit staff input on draft

planning committee finalize plan in written form

library and literacy coalition will publicize the plan

STATE: do all the above as well

Issue: **DEVELOP POSITION STATEMENT ON WHY THE LITERACY PROGRAM SHOULD BE IN THE LIBRARY**

Options:

State will gather and disseminate justifications which support library-based literacy programs.

Library project staff and participants will identify justifications for their local library-based literacy program.

Using the 2 recommendations above, the Library Directors and staff will develop a position statement on why the literacy program should be in the library.

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' Priority Issues and Possible Options

Issue: **FUNDING AND EVALUATION**

Options:

Set up non-profit structure to receive funds

Re-order state priorities to extend CLSA funding beyond 5th year

Establish uniform measures for evaluation, e.g. number of people in program, length of time each learner in program, whether each learner met own goals

Develop appropriate mix of funding between state and local

Get industry involved in order to improve employees' skills

Convince government officials to switch priorities to fund literacy

That libraries can recruit companies for students (or tutors) and company will give funding for that student (volunteer match program)

Work toward utility tax on Cable TV to fund literacy

Encourage joint applications for state grants (among jurisdictions)

Adult literacy oriented radio series

Los Angeles County's professional fundraiser

Raise taxes

Eliminate the Gann limit

Convince business that it is cost effective to support literacy

Get lottery funds

Can get ADA for every student/tutor program if adult education has not hit the cap

Adopt a student or adopt a tutor

Assess cities for benefits of having literate population

Issue: **INTEGRATING LITERACY WITH REGULAR LIBRARY SERVICES**

Options:

Combine with other outreach services

Split into various library units, e.g. publicity, volunteers, training, materials

Select most crucial local component to do e.g. provide space only, serve as a training center, provide I and R service, provide materials

Establish as top management priority-internal and external support

Develop a volunteer program

Co-sponsor with community agencies

Issue: **DEALING WITH PROGRAM GROWTH**

Options:

Limit intake/waiting lists

Recruit more volunteers to provide support and management activities

Seek increased assistance from other agencies and resource specialists, e.g. social service providers

Set realistic goals

Expand quality training for tutors

Network with local community groups

Issue: ROLE OF STATE LIBRARY--ESPECIALLY WITH FUNDRAISING; MAKING LITERACY A STATE/FEDERAL PRIORITY

Options:

Fundraise at the major corporate level--CSL to coordinate and create a foundation to receive those funds (and disburse!)

Provide information and continuing education on literacy materials and techniques rather than focusing on program monitoring

Influence federal priorities through lobbying for both legislation and regulation and publicizing the CLC program

Provide publicity on a statewide basis to which we can all link, paid for by foundation

Provide consultant for local fundraising e.g. to do workshops

Work to achieve sense of state and federal urgency

Issue: PROVIDING SERVICES TO NON-CLC FUNDED AREAS

Options:

That libraries would receive reimbursement for training tutors and serving students who come from other districts

That libraries would be reimbursed for students regardless of where they came from

That potential students or tutors would be referred to other existing agencies e.g. Laubach

That there be priority in refunding expansion grants

COORDINATORS' Priority Issues and Possible Options:

Issue: FUNDING

Options:

Stabilization of existing programs by state through baseline funding

Address CLC funding inequities.

Funding for new programs

Professional fundraising

501(c)(3)?

Other: lottery loot? direct mail; subscriptions; planned giving; charging for services--materials, tutor training, tutor service, use of facilities; United Way? large event (regional)

Issue: **THE LOCAL LITERACY SERVICE: WHOSE BABY IS IT?**

IF LIBRARY'S--THEN FULLY INTEGRATE INTO ALL ASPECTS OF THE LIBRARY.

IF NOT LIBRARY'S--WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE AND WHAT IS MECHANISM FOR FINDING A HOME?

Options:

Get COMMITMENT from library administration or Cooperative Library System

Develop action plan--long range planning

Integrate into library program, i.e.

a. Incorporate into organization chart
b. Quantify parts of literacy which equate to library measured activities, e.g. hours circulation, registration, etc.
c. Be considered on a par with Reference, Children's Services, AV, etc
d. Budget

If NOT library ownership, then what ????

Other: Adult learners are taxpayers entitled to library services including literacy

501(c)(3) approach

Issue: **HOW TO EVALUATE SUCCESS**

DEFINE SUCCESS--DETERMINE WHO IS GOING TO DEFINE IT--AND WHY WE ARE EVALUATING SUCCESS

Options:

Objective measures such as standardized testing, retention rate, functional reading ability.

Subjective measures:

Adult learner declares success
Tutor declares success

Behavioral changes:

Decreased dependency
Participation in community issues

Issue: **QUANTITY VS QUALITY**

A) DEFINE SERVICE AREAS
B) VOLUNTEER AND TUTOR SUPERVISION

SET QUALITATIVE GOALS/PRIORITIZE AND COMMUNICATE TO GAIN ADMINISTRATIVE BACKING

Options:

A1. Limiting growth--set cap

A2. Refuse participants from outside jurisdiction

A3. Fund new programs

A/B Tighten standards for student/tutor intake

B1. Increase staff paid or volunteer

B2. Increase in-service tutor training--mandatory number?

Other: Tighten standards for student enrollment; use city/county boundaries; be more selective in accepting tutors

Issue: **CLARIFY ROLE OF THE STATE CONSULTANTS**

Options:

Clarify state consultants (literacy) job descriptions by putting in writing and listing SPECIFIC areas of expertise (with input from local coordinators)

Provide problem-solving assistance related to local area AND recommend specific activities a project could take.

Provide a means of coordinating regional funding efforts vs encouraging individual competition among projects.

Assume responsibility for statewide projects (ie. promotion, PR, fundraising vs requesting local projects to coordinate these campaigns.

Other: request SPECIFIC ACTIONS to take--not just generalizations; problem-told vs problem-solving; need tools to solve problems

Appendix V-a

ISSUES BRAINSTORMED, BY GROUP, UNEDITED

COORDINATORS:

Dealing with mentally retarded and learning disabled and stroke victims

Examining methodology--who is method effective with?

Defining service areas--municipalities not served? jurisdiction conflicts

Dealing with State requests for information--dealing with state information

How does state describe a statewide progrm to the legislature and government

Job description of a literacy coordinator

Screening/firing volunteers

Meeting individual learner needs who learn other than we expect, i.e. learning styles

Continuing volunteer and tutor supervision

Encouraging other community groups to begin programs

protecting State's investment in personnel

Maximizing California State taspayer's investment in literacy

Media support

Training

Funding - more money for effectiveness

Attracting learners

Integrating/involving learners into policy-making level

Whose baby is it? if Library's, fully integrate into all aspects of service; if not Library's, work with CLC to develop methods for "adoption"

Quantity vs quality--limit growth? define service areas; continue volunteer and tutor supervision

Measure effectiveness in terms of how if affects library service goals

Learner/tutor retention

What is literacy? reading? functioning?

What is CLC's role in literacy?

Time/stress management for staff

Local program needs vs State consultants' needs being met--
CLARIFY ROLE OF STATE CONSULTANT

How to involve community and business groups in coalition building and how to make coalitions work for CLC?

ong range vs short term planning

How to evaluate success--for students

Reaching group 3 and 4 learners

Communication: Administrative level -> learners/tutors

Regional group activities; inter-library program network

Funding inequities

CLC's needs in competition with other needs of the library

Seeking Federal support

Consciousness-raising in other non-CLC libraries

Funding
- state beyond 5 years
- local - public
- local - non-public
- federal
- fundraising - 501c3
- lots of competition for literacy funds

How to market and justify effective L.L.S.'s to local and state decision makers.
- keep momentum going to make literacy highly visible

Active participation in state and local coalitions

Defining what literacy means
- literacy for empowerment
- literacy for "domestication"
- literacy for survival

Learner assessment and evaluation

Using CLC for equipment--especially computers and copiers

To what degree should ESL be involved in total program?

Defining role of literacy service within the overall ongoing library services program

Effective training for tutors in adult learner goal setting

Dealing with Department of Social Services/Probation re recalcitrant learners

Expectations of coordinators roles and responsibilities need to be more realistic
- part/fulltime staff
- large or small programs
- resource allocations

Help Adult Schools remove cap on ADA from the state

What can we expect from the STATE LIBRARY?
- technical assistance
- time reports/legislation
- realistic time line
- CLC reports (how are they using them)

Dropout--retention of adult learners and tutors

Breaking the cycle of illiteracy--how to cope with size of problem (program growth)

Program evaluation

LIBRARY DIRECTORS:

Funding

Program that attracts funding.

Evaluation

Base funding on number served

Need for more physical space

Who determines standards--libraries or providers

Dealing with community competition

Recruiting volunteers

Awareness of the problem

Dealing with symptons--what is cause?

ESL

GAIN

Integrating literacy with regular library programs

Recognition of students and tutors

Aeparating training from advocacy

Cap on literacy funding

Greater student involvement

Greater library involvement by surrounding libraries

High cost of expendable materials

Waiting lists

Consultancy from State Library

Relationships with other local departments such as probation health services

Competing with other community groups

Dealing with program growth

Integration/relationship with adult education

Providing library education with literacy

Self-motivated learners vs those required to learn

Avoiding turning library into social service centers

Whether to consider non-profit status

How to become more regional

Non-participating neighboring libraries

Local control

Realistic goals for the program

Taking what we've learned from literacy to other programs

Dealing with excuses of how not to get involved

Retaining visibility over the long haul

Location of literacy program in the library program on a permanent basis

Role of state library, especially with fundraising

Involvement of industry

Kind of program--paid vs. volunteer

Making it a priority at state and federal level

How to provide encouragement to learners

How to break down barriers to reach groups that are hard to reach

Literacy service as an either/or situation (priorities)

SUPERVISORS:

Integrate program with library program and staff without coordinators "doing own thing"

Secure funding

To serve ESL or English-speaking

How to phase back on program if additional funding not obtained

How to expand program given funding restraints

Need solid arguments to put out re: why the program should be in the library.

Long range plan for program

Adult learners take active role in programs and in tutoring

Short term gain but long term pain--what to do with "one-shot" funding--expectations

Deal with staff turnover and burnout

How to evaluate student progress

Maintain focus--"What makes this program special and effective?"

Develop collections

Additudes--approach things as a problem or as an opportunity

Role of state library--long or short term planning

Deal with student dropout

Maintain high quality instruction (also measure/evaluate quality)

Make reading program a regular service of the library

Appendix V-b: Large Group Brainstorm re Funding

Woodland Literacy Council	Mountain Bike Raffle	$1,000
National City (501(c)(3) of Friends)	San Diego C. Charities	2,500
San Bernardino	501(c)(3) from Coalition	2,000
Los Angeles City	United Chamber of Commerce Luncheon	2,000
Alameda	Soroptomists (not a lot of procedure)	3,200
Los Angeles City	Jr. League grant (3 year for extention to community)	55,000
Placentia	Disneyland Community Services	5,000
San Bernardino	Gannett	10,000
Imperial County	US Department of Education	25,000
	Drawing for a painting	3,500
Woodland	Adult Education Service Grant	6,000
National City	Chili Cookoff	1,000
Menlo Park	2 Mercury Savings Luncheons	1,500
Stockton	Gannett grants	7,500
Woodland	CD Block Grant (?)	10,000
	Lions Club	150
Ventura County	Sheriff's Department Inmate Fund toward reading specialist's salary	5,600
	Adult Basic Education toward reading specialist's salary	4,000
Woodland	Community College toward tutor training	1,200
San Luis Obispo County	Adult School toward cost of teacher	???
Sacramento	Aetna Life toward training workshop	5,000
	Soroptomist	350
Santa Clara County	CTA (to honor a volunteer teacher)	200
Menlo Park	Adult Education pays for training when done by their teacher	???

NOTE: PIC carryover funds will no longer be carried over--apply for grants NOW for this year--JTPA under Title VI for programs supporting GAIN

Shasta	PIC (computer-aided instruction)	50,000
	Foundation for Community Cablevision	5,000
	Soroptomist (pending) for video	1,400
	B. Dalton (2 years at 500 each)	1,000
Siskiyou	Read Radio ($ to 501(c)(3) for 10 short stories	3,000
	Humanities Grant, Chico State	20,000
	Community Action Grant	10,000
	Siskiyou Performing Arts for video	800
Fresno County	LSCA Title VI grant	24,950
	Department of Social Services (renewable yearly)	19,000
Santa Clara County	Businesswomen International grant	500
Watsonville	Adult Education part of coordinators salary	
Commerce	Famous Amos Cookie Store percent of afternoon's proceeds	???
Watsonville	College Magazine "Literacy West" percent of sales	???

Napa	Race	800
Oakland	Author's Luncheon (with Newspaper & Library Association) per luncheon	2,000-3,000
Mendocino County	United Way grant via coalition's 501(c)(3) for video	500
San Luis Obispo	Foundation for Community Service Cable TV	5,000
Tehama County	Radiothon	10,000
San Diego County	Gannett for computers	4,700
National City	Copley Foundation Grant	50,000
Brookmeyer Memorial	Rotary	1,000
Placentia	Cookbook sales so far	700
	Presbyterian Church	300-400
Alameda County	Letters to Tutor's Employers	400-500
	Adult School Trainer's training	???
Shasta	PIC (renew every 6 months)	11,500
Woodland	US Department of Education Title VI grant	22,000
City of Commerce	Music Recital	400
Oakland	Shaklee grant (for volunteer recognition)	500
	IBM	500
	Gannett	10,000
	Gifts from tutors	10-1,000
	Combined Federal Campaign	50

LONG TERM FUNDING

Look at ways for people to continue giving money year after year

Woodland: Develop literacy service to be sold to business community

Modoc County: Sell beef strips

Alameda County: Should be paid for by public money, federal, state commitment

Develop tax incentives to make literacy and education more important

Check off on state income tax return (donate 1-2 dollars to literacy)

Everybody buy lottery tickets

Elimate Gann initiative

Get private sector to support passage of local tax measures

Local governments should feel some responsibility for funding

Coordinate funding at state level particularly corporate

State level professional fundraising

Work with Department of Education--include riders on their bills to fund literacy

Federal Government make efforts for them to take a greater role

Too much centralization at Government level can impede local success

Get part of lottery money via legislation

Explore creation of state-level endowment

Support local Broadcasting's PLUS program

Alameda - May - "Wills Clinic" leave money in wills to agencies

Library directors need to remind local government that CLC's original plan was eventual local money support

NOTE: Someone in the group said there will be no more funds available from Foundation for Community Cablevision

Appendix V-c

DIRECTORS' AD HOC DISCUSSION OF FUNDING

The Library Directors group did some discussion of their funds and funding experience at the end of their Thursday session on sharing. The information should be a helpful addendum to the large-group brainstorming about fund raising.

HAVE WE MADE AN IMPACT ON ABILITY TO GET FUNDING--DOES THIS TRANSLATE INTO HARD CASH?

has resulted in cash for literacy and other programs--$190,000 in special grant from Fresno County

Shasta got $50,000

Woodland-- $3,000 building project plus $30,000 in grants for literacy

Huntington Beach--revenue sharing from county; Xerox; total amoung $30,000

Oakland--$30,000 from community and Tribune

San Diego County--3 grants for National City and Carlsbad; approval of budget by Board of Supervisors

National City--$40,000 in grant money; increase in budget by 7-12%

Alameda County--more money to literacy and general budget--not out of red yet

Imperial County--$28,000 grant and donation

Santa Clara Co--industry has paid for some materials

Siskiyou County--important to distinguish dollar amount from renewable amount and percentage of budget; how to get salary money on annually renewable basis

South San Francisco: hasn't raised anything because it's part of regular budget

CSL--legislative support 0 to $4 million in less than 3 years

Stockton--people coming forward as tutors will put conversation into right places in town; ask tutors to pay for materials--demonstrates commitment; ask students to buy materials if they are able

VI. MAKING LITERACY AN INTEGRAL LIBRARY SERVICE

The Friday morning small-group sessions were postponed long enough to enable a large group session to brainstorm regarding short- and long-term funding options. This was necessary because funding remained an issue about which nearly everyone desired more information and exchange of ideas. The facilitator adjusted the agenda accordingly and she and two recorders managed the large-group discussion.

The ensuing suggestions were primarily ones which had worked for literacy projects. Participants asked that the listing of possible funding sources be made available to them as soon as possible. That was done. The same material is appended to this chapter.

In a related situation the previous day, the library directors group had discussed funding and fundraising, after having shared what they had learned from the Campaign. Notes from their discussion also are appended to this chapter.

The configuration of the small groups was changed for the last session of the retreat. Instead of persons with the same responsibilities meeting together, as had happened before, the small groups now were composed of the public library teams (a director and literacy coordinator from the same library or a directory, supervisor and literacy coordinator from the same library). Their task was to "identify how adult literacy and learning programs can become/are becoming a part of public library services." Because of the importance of this issue to the future of CLC, the group proceedings are included here in their entirety. (The groups handled the task as two questions, as will be done here.)

Question 1: HOW ARE ADULT LITERACY AND LEARNING PROGRAMS BECOMING A PART OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES?

Humboldt County--assisted system for new readers
--to get library card and preselected books from which to choose, new reader makes appointment with reference desk; book called "Welcome to the library"

Alameda County--literacy staff is civil service, project specialist category (P designation)
part of Extension Service physically and organizationally
branch managers active in literacy council
Special Services meetings (e.g. Children's, Reference, Young Adult, Clerical) to discuss working together

HOW MUCH TIME IS INVOLVED IN FUNDRAISING?

It isn't what we do well; we're clumsy at it. Not confident that we raise more than we spend.

Too much time.

Hire a professional fundraiser to assess whether community can raise $50,000 in 2 years.

Literacy Affiliates Board is responsible for fundraising; library offers in-kind services.

Los Angeles County Foundation has hired a fundraiser to develop a proposal and to assist in presentation (6 month contract).

Woodland staff and literacy council spend lots of time fundraising. One staff member 25%

Shasta literacy staff 25% of time

As state funding decreases and need increases, percentage of time increases.

HOW MUCH TIME DO LIBRARY DIRECTORS SPEND WORKING WITH LOCAL JURISDIC TIONS FUNDRAISING FOR ALL PROGRAMS?

100%

HOW MUCH TIME ON FUNDRAISING FOR ALL SERVICES (COOKIE SALES)?

at least 25%

HOW MUCH FOR LITERACY FUNDRAISING?

0 TO 20% (one day a week doing things that help raise money--attending functions, supporting literacy council, etc.

annual meeting with staff at each library
hire coordinator from inside library--already accepted part of staff

San Bernardino--staff workshop on literacy
bimonthly branch meeting reports
Note: special logo separates literacy program from the rest of the library--and color of ink costs to print

Marin County--hired from within library (project manager)
outside literacy speakers at staff meetings, e.g. Youth Service Center speaker
annotated bibliography of new reader materials

San Bernadino County--temporary classification as site supervisor
coordinator is permanent

Ventura--literacy coordinator comes to branch staff meetings
present graduates with library card
new pathfinders to show how to use library

Oakland--systemwide workshop
line staff workshop
spun out of Main branch and have materials at every branch

Carlsbad--build collections in library
identification package connects name of library with literacy program
processing through City
coordinator part of civil service

Oakland--service is known as a library service because of publicity

San Bernadino--library card issued to new student
all literacy materials are checked out with library card
certificatas of appreciation to tutors

Marin--library cards issued to new students

Santa Paula--staff speak about literacy as a library program

Alameda--news on the stick
software specifically for literacy program

Richmond--tour of library for tutor trainees

Bruggmeyer:
literacy program in library, central
moved staff member over

include regular staff--supports it
weekly staff meeting
literacy coordinator listed in city budget
staff member got donation
literacy displays in library
fulltime position

San Diego County:
staff at all meetings
position on organization chart
staff in branches, displays too
tutors and trainers recruited from staff
staff hire through civil service
change name from "project"
moved trailer next to library
staff member 1/2 time each

Santa Ana:
call it literacy services--on chart!
presented to city manager for budget
tutors part of regular library volunteers

Long Beach:
in branch now, staff was librarian
out for some local funding
one position and clerk in budget now
report at all staff meetings, work with outreach
collections in ALL libraries
working on community services librarian

City of Commerce:
literacy department acts like others--most don't know
coordinator active in library
want to expand outreach program

Alameda City:
see above plus calling cards as ANOTHER library service
planned for TOTAL integration--supplies, record keeping
listed in city budget, city personnel hires

Riverside:
in budget--first for grant project
funds for equipment for library
precedures developed for staff
liasons in branch, attend meetings
emphasize "new readers as library users"
library board member on advisory committee
Friends group major committment

Fresno:
see above plus
branches borrow literacy service books
literacy staff are resource to general staff
to expand, find rural branch staff REQUESTS the service

from them

Palm Springs:
outreach, aquisitions, meetings similar above
library looks for funding for all!

Watsonville:
not too well integrated yet, small, burdened
tried pull from staff--can't
heavy outreach program
emphasis on workind with school Adult Education
(pick up some part of salary)
city council sees literacy as school district
responsibility

Siskiyou:
director intimately involved (up to 2 days week)
problem
participancy depends on: fiscal health, size of library
and original level of CLC funding
all staff sensitized--skills, reference
provide materials, supplies, some space

Mendocino:
all of above
no financial integration--separate grant
daily contact, one on site
attend staff meetings

many presentations/sharing to entire staff
clippings collected and shared
newsletter shared with staff
presentation at in-service day
library staff gives tutor presentations on AV, reference,
computer, circulation
library materials budget spent on supplementary materials
statistics reports as if they are a branch
CLC coordinator considered part of staff and attends
meetings
tutors meet at library, get materials there
CLC staff-paid part of library staff coordinator is head of
a division
integrated materials...circulated
staff encouraged to take tutor training
CLC staff on city payroll as permanent employees with
full benefits
CLC staff provides advice and expertise to other libraries
in area
CLC staff acts as consultant--services to use
integration of CLC staff in join projects
head county librarian now giving money for materials
CLC program needs now incorporated in new building plans
staff cross-training in literacy for future new branch

50% money support to CLC from County budget since 1975
supervision of CLC to a library staff person--great step forward
library bookkeeper handles CLC
bookmobile--includes a literacy specialist
coordinates with Children's Room for Reading Game-summer
CLC bags used for rainy days
children's librarian to train students in reading to their children
CLC tutors and volunteers recognized with library and city volunteers
literacy program accepts Year of Reader award
staff member brings relative in for help
literacy staff a part of library orientation
part time literacy clerk given extra hours
literacy person works at night in circulation
literacy book section for adults near I and R section
students encouraged to use I and R staff for questions and problems
acquisition department does CLC purchasing
volunteers in CLC are recruited and trained by library
let community, city council, etc. know that literacy is part library (NATL CITY)
creating separations
6 coordinators in group not librarians, 4 are librarians
Los Angeles--good job of associating library with literacy with public mind
Placentia--Head of Adult Services is a library employee--library is supportive
literacy program came to library through Board --> developed affiliate --> got grant --> continued without that support --> 6 affiliates healthy --> meeting of presidents of affiliates
in some situations, program is not part of library
initiation of program came out of administrative offices in L.A. --salary of coordinator from grant
have to put in budget request for funding of project
L.A. --newsletter to all agencies
operating literacy program part of overall library volunteer program
all branch libraries accept tutors

South San Francisco--literacy IS a library program, NEEDED
not a library program until jurisdiction says so
combination: Library Service--Public needs to know that funding comes from variety of pockets
Imperial County--went to board of supervisors for approval to integrate CLC into library (got approval) back overhead
concern over question of literacy program being part of library service--has to be acceptance of literacy by library professionals
you identify commitment when you build new buildings
libraries need to meet agenda of the present and future
literacy program acceptable because it is an "informal"

arrangement with education services
we need to be clear, ourselves, how literacy has evolved as library service and fills a clear need
document budget proposals with info from ALL literacy providers
everyone has different situations
problem of being a GANN limitation
problem--convincing local jurisdiction that they will be "picking up the tab"
have to fight to have literacy program to become part of library services
now coalition becoming a part of library service
lack of facilities can become a problem
need a director who will fight for you
money hard to find (cities--boards)
more libraries who not waiting to participate and this retreat will be significant
needs to be supportive of on-going budget--degree of local state funding
talk abut how state laws mandate equal access
serious need in county (most basic service can have in library)
South San Francisco--slide show of tutors/students shown to community--talk about VALUE to community
quantity of hours provided to city
supply FACTS-- TANGIBLE services
serving the underserved and unserved
how to "give" political entity something--e.g. reading center located in EACH council district; council members invited to meetings; do voters support this program?

city's priorities not always library's priorities
library director puts literacy in GOALS/objectives in library program
difficult--make hard choices for future agenda--library directors
some libraries will absorb literacy programs--some don't
variety of differences

what are practicalities to convince city managers?
- problem of having to respond to "status quo" budget
- "hide it"
- go to CEO and make needs known--bring up to date
- coordinator "slipped" into a regular employee of city library
- go to city manager (can't end-run)
- get public support--and go to city councilman
- have to be careful with city manager--problem--we need to make a strategy--for dealing with city manager for funding approval

Question 2: HOW CAN ADULT LITERACY AND LEARNING PROGRAMS BECOME A PART OF LIBRARY SERVICES?

hire from within library--staff already accepted by peers
(depends on strength of staff; depends on locale and on how you work them in)
incorporate literacy logo into LIBRARY logo statewide
get more funding
get volunteers, librarians into one extension program
get onto regular library budget
flow through state library program
local budget--easier if you're in a growing tax base
local budget--a mateer of priorities--when state funds run out, literacy may be funded locally, but something may have to go
develop strategy to get to Council--through Friends or some other third party
call the program "outreach"--may sell better
choice of programs to be budgeted should be with library, not city manager of CAO
libraries will have to prioritize, in view of budget cuts
Director strategy for local support = money
Reassess priorities of library--literacy at top
Psychological integration--regular staff orders, etc.
Assign people to branches--not together
Library staff facilitates tutor sessions/train
Work closer with outreach services
Include literacy in library goals and objectives/ procedures manual
Expand CLSA to include literacy?

Directors help with political ground-breaking with POWERS THAT BE"
Name change from Project to a program or service
Establish a foundation
More detail training for regular staff so they can make references to literacy
Select literacy materials as a part of regular book/ material selection
Focus on literacy participants using the library and its srevices
Long range plan--set it together
Develop ways to help literacy people feel "less like orphans"
Business card and brochure say "services"
Need funding and total commitment by director
Understand separate and distinct functions of literacy services
Integrate literacy staff as part of the budget process
Special circumstance--this program is managed by a professional who is not a librarian
Integrate with "Friends" to retain 501c3
Develop separate trust fund for tax deductible contributions
Student involvement--push a learner to be involved

What about lottery money as a source to support all these ideas
find a way to cooperate with non-CLC neighbors
I and R services should make appropriate referrals based on accurate info; "first phone call counts"
Sacramento public TV provides directory of literacy services in area
get cooperative systems to buy in across state
repackage literacy services to fit in with county goals and continue to communicate it to the county (key to longterm funding)
BE POLITICAL

COMMENTS:

Regional Foundation to receive and disburse funds...
who would administer?
ensure fairness?

relieve competition, turf wars
parochialism of possible supporters
A MILLION BARRIERS!

We're dealing with SYMPTOMS not CAUSES in why there are so many illiterates
tie into children's services
tie-in to legislation, i.e. Roberti bill
problem large: from family unit to Federal Government
if we can sell Coca Cola, we can sell literacy
need conscious endorsement from government
multi-facited problem
where to place blame? --many places
need to take an advocacy position dealing with causes

Literacy could be ALA President's annual theme--convince him/her to gain visibility

CONCERNS:

library board not bought into idea of literacy programs
identifying appropriate materials and their use for adult learners
staff of library unaware of functioning of literacy program
library staff overworked--can't respond effectively to literacy program needs
communication /marketing problems and cost-effectiveness of such
pressure to offer ESL in literacy program--big demand, unable to meet; need to get local money to help this situation
ESL and literacy are separate problems
ESL services provided by Adult Education but can't meet all needs of ESL
parents want CLC to help CHILDREN to read

getting non-participating libraries involved in CLC
(a nice idea, but no money)
non-CLC libraries need to allow tutors and learners from
their community to use their space
in large geographic areas--some communities have no centers-
not enough money dramatically
BALIS model BALIT system) offshoot of BALIS
in creating cooperation
includes 2 non-member libraries in coalition
neighboring systems help market CLC--PR materials
non-member libraries provide rooms
10 hour a week librarian consults in literacy
non-member marketing program
library as clearinghouse
non-member communities need to be aware a literacy
problem exists
money set aside to fund 'PAYBACKS' when non-CLC libraries'
clients are served
build on existing programs

VII. STATE AND PUBLIC LIBRARY ROLES IN THE CLC

The only retreat objective around which a specific part of the agenda was not built was the objective to "reaffirm the roles of the California State Library and of public libraries in the California Literacy Campaign." It was, however, an overarching objective of the entire retreat.

Clarification of State and local library roles was the third most frequently mentioned subject when coordinators expressed their expectations for the event. All groups made some mention of it in their discussion of priority issues.

The State Librarian did some interpreting of the roles in all three of his addresses. Note again in the Questions and Comments Addressed to the State Librarian (appended to Chapter III) how often the role question was mentioned.

When participants shared what they had experienced and learned from involvement in the CLC (Chapter IV), a number of comments were very affirming of the various libraries' roles. For example:

> Increased visibility in community through leadership in CLC
>
> Shows us a whole new way for libraries to be part of the educational system
>
> Success of CLC is based on statewide effort
>
> Confirmation of public library role in education as an educational institution
>
> Libraries need to provide other programs and services to support the learners

When participants identified priority issues and concerns, integration of literacy into regular library services was on every groups's list. Other pertinent priority issues identified (see Chapter V) dealt with defining or clarifying State Library roles and the need to develop a position statement on why literacy should be in the library.

The questions of state and local library roles also seemed to be one of the most often-discussed topics in informal participant meetings and conversations.

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT
CLOSING REMARKS

February 27, 1987
Asilomar, California

Gary E. Strong
State Librarian of California

We have experienced a most productive time over the last few hours. The discussion has surpassed that which we could have hoped. Attempting to summarize our experience, a remark of Lawrence Clark Powell's comes to mind, "I really have nothing new to say -- never had since the day I cam home from first grade and complained to my mother about my teacher. What I said to my mother was, 'I've been to school a whole day and I can't read and I can't write. What's she for?'." I hope that we have a sense of what we are for at this point in our common effort.

I want to acknowledge several individuals who contributed significantly to the success of our time together. The Steering Committee assisted in planning the agenda for the retreat. Carmela Ruby from the State Library Staff coordinated planning and logistics to get our job done. Connie Shapiro handled conference logistics, registration, and communication with each of us to ensure that arrangements were always in order. Marilyn Snider and her team of facilitators and recorders kept us on track and assisted greatly in our discussion. Marti Lane has served as our evaluator and will be sure that we have a record of our work together. And to each of you, a particular thanks for sticking with the work and contributing at each step.

I believe that we have achieved the desired outcomes for the retreat. Much sharing has occured concerning the purpose and vision of the California Literacy Campaign. You have identified how adult literacy and learning programs can become a part of public library services. We have reaffirmed the roles ofthe California State Library and of public libraries in the Campaign. As I mentioned, much sharing of what we have learned from our experience has been accomplished. In your working sessions yesterday you identified key issues and possible options for addressing those issues. I am pleased there was a degree of agreement on key issues, for this will help us to focus on solutions.

I would like to address several areas of concern posed by retreat participants at several points during our time together. Of course, the primary concern for us all is funding. There are five areas of effort currently being addressed by the state library. They are:

1. Maintenance of the current $4,035,000 appropriation. This appropriation is in the present baseline for special services of the California Library Services Act and is secure. At least as secure as any baseline ever is in the state budget.
2. Seek aumentation of the CLSA baseline for 1987/88 in the amount of $1,100,000 fund to fund the some twenty-three additional libraries that wish to participate in the Campaign. The Governor did not include this augmentation in his budget recommendations. At its meeting in February, the California Library Services Board voted to vigorously work toward this augmentation in the legislative session and calls upon all libraries to join in that struggle.
3. Work for additional funding to add new communities and sites in existing programs. It is the intent to expand the campaign to new communities and neighborhoods within existing CLC libraries. It has never been the intent to spread resources so thin that programs can not function adequately.
4. Seek stablization of state funding after the fifth year commitment currently supported by the California Library Services Board. I indicated my interest in working toward that objective.
5. Support the Families for Literacy legislation currently introduced as SB 482 by Senator Roberti as a logical expansion of the Campaign.

The process to address these areas of additional funding support has several steps. They are:

1. To develop strategy to address each issue.
2. Gain agreement of the library community.
3. The California Library Services Board consider options at its meeting in August 1987 when budget considerations are made.
4. Develop a budget change proposal for submission to the Governor for his consideration.
5. If approved by the Governor, the BCP would be considered by the Legislature.

6. If successful, funding would be available July 1, 1988.

The process of "selling" the need for funding at the state level parallels that at the local level. At the state level, we must work with the library community on setting literacy funding as a priority. The California Library Services Board must approve a plan for funding. The Governor must include funding in his budget request to the Legislature. And, the Legislature must approve the funding proposal. At the local level, you must convince your community that literacy is important and that funds are needed to meet your goals. Your library staff and library board must agree to your plan. The City Manager or CAO of the County must agree to include funding for the program. And, a city council or board of supervisors must agree that literacy should receive funding in the library budget.

Keep in mind that the issue of local funding is separate from local fundraising. Without the commitment of local funding, it will be extremely difficult to maintain the commitment of state support. Suggestions were made that the State Library should coordinate fundraising at the state level. It is preliminary to attempt to answer that questions at this retreat.

Several other questions were posed to which I would like to offer preliminary reactions. I want to assure you that we will continue to examine the technical assistance role of the California State Library in support of local programs. I appreciate your suggetions and comments in this area. As the Campaign changes, the State Library must be ready to adjust its support as well.

Why fund new programs when you are taking dollars away from existing programs? For me it is a matter of equity. We have always envisioned the CLC as a statewide program and our goal has been to include every public library that wants to offer services. At this point there are no literacy services offered by public libraries in twenty-nine of the fifty-four counties in California. The problem of service demand from currently unserved areas on existing programs can only be solved by funding programs in those areas. I hope that you will join me in working toward making CLC truly statewide.

What happens when we do not meet the funding formula? We have attempted in our disucssions with funding agencies to gain commitment for state funding without mandates on local government. We will be more successful if indeed there is local funding that maintains the service to meet the demand. How you meet the local share, I believe, should be your responsiblity.

What is the impact of GAIN, PIC, and other programs on CLC? If you should add programs that draw funding from programs that require participation, I challenge you to be sure that the original purpose of the Campaign not erode. We entered into literacy services to provide a program for those who, for themselves, would choose to participate. That programs would meet individuals interests and goals. If that original purpose can stand along side participation with programs such as GAIN, then fine.

I know that many of you and your libraries made a commitment to literacy services before the California Literacy Campaign. My role is to speak for the CLC, and I have every confidence that you will speak out for your own commitment. Likewise, I realize that many of you have made funding commitments beyond that which is matched by the state. Again, I will expect you to speak out for these commitments. My responsibility is to represent the state and the state's commitments. In doing so, I do not wish to diminish in any way your tradition and commitment.

We are involved in a state and local partnership. We must not put all of our eggs in one basket for literacy services. There must be buy-in at all levels. At the State Library we must be accountable to maintain and augment state funding for stablization and expansion of CLC. At the local level, you must be accountable for local program management and success in order to secure local dollars and commitment.

We have been concerned that we address the issue of adult learner evaluation before we are forced to use evaluation methods that would force us to "look like the rest of education." The State Library has issued a request for proposal for a two phase adult learner evaluation project.

Phase one calls for an inventory and description of what each CLC program is doing in the area of adult learner evaluation. It is intended to be a non-

judgmental catalog of current practice to provide an overview of various options. The second part of this phase will be the development of a plan for how we can best develop a process of adult learner evaluation that will be ongoing and meaningful to the CLC. The producets from this pahse will be due on June 30, 1987.

Phase two will call for the development of a process for adult learner evaluation that can be done on an on-going evaluation. This will be due by January 31, 1988. Our aim is to develop a process that the California Literacy Campaing will "own," and that we can use to our own best benefit. We do not wish to force adult learners in CLC programs to experience the measurement that often has not been favorable for them in past experience. On the other hand, our aim is to provide programs, the State Library, and state government with a means to measure our success.

We are pleased to have had the bonus of LSCA Title VI funding to support this workshop. We must be mindful that this LSCA money is one year soft money. that will go away. We must not become dependent on it as an on-going source of funds. This, we hope, will be the purpose of state funding.

The State Library is applying for a grant during this next phase of LSCA Title VI to support an adult learner day in Sacramento in 1988. The seminar is intended to bring a selected group of new readers to Sacramento to visit their State Library -- to see its collections and treasures and to see first hand the state government legislative process at work.

I want to speak directly to the Coordinators for just a moment. You are very special people. Like the pioneers, you are out front, exposed often to fragile program support. Like the early county library organizers in California you are in the role of administrator, trainer, educator, publicist, fundraiser, community organizer, and more. Like your colleagues as children's librarians, outreach workers, information and referral specialists, audio-visual programmers, and reference librarians, you carry the responsibility for managing and defending a service offered through the library. Band with other coordinators and peers in the library. Tell your story, seek their commitment and support.

In a letter to me recently, Carma Leigh, who was State Librarian of California from 1952 to 1972 said,

> "We are coming to realize the simple but basic need of everyone to read in order to get along in everyday life. Without ability and opportunity to read, there is an incalcuable loss of awareness of so much around one, stunting of ability to communicate and receive throuths and ideas, not to mention the even greater loss of the pleasure and understanding from reading. People thus deprived cannot function fully in life, and not only they but the rest of society suffer because of their handicap, a handicap that can in most cases be remedied. With the number of such deprived, for whatever reason, growing so large and as now known, there is cause for alarm, as it is clear democracy depends on education and reading. Yes librarians and libraries are right when, in addition to already heavy responsibilities, they also work with others to teach those who cannot read."

There is much to do and too little resource with which to do it. We need bonds locally among library directors, supervisors, and literacy coordinators. And with the State Library in collaboaration toward meeting our goals. We all share the dream, but we have and work in different realities. We must have the trust in each other to move forward; and the ability to differentiate between transitory frustrations and compelling needs.

A news reporter asked me recently of my vision of libraries in the future. I replied, "... public libraries will include community centers, meetings rooms for community groups and education, media areas, concert facilities. We have fallen away from human dialogue. Conversation has moved, literally to the barroom, to the Happy Hour. Everywhere you look, you see gyms and recreational centers to keep our bodies fit. I think we need mental fitness centers--to regenerate the mind."

VIII. OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Observations

This section presents observations and comments according to outcome, then concludes with general and related recommendations. The tables sprinkled throughout this chapter are taken directly from the participants' written evaluations, a complete copy of which is appended. The results are reported by percentage which indicates the mode (the most frequently given responses). Such a technique is useful for measuring the most characteristic value of a group. The mode is not influenced by extreme scores and is useful when studying a large number of cases in a distribution.

It is important to be aware of the numbers of respondants in each category. A total of 117 evaluations were turned in by:

37 Public Library Directors (or their substitutes)
22 Supervisors of CLC Coordinators
41 CLC Coordinators
4 California Library Services Board Members
8 State Library Staff
5 others who did not indicate "type of participant"

Because of the much smaller group size of CLSB Members and State Library staff, their percentages may be somewhat skewed. The overall group percentages are particularly important, therefore.

1. Reaffirm the Purpose and Shared Vision of the CLC

Participants felt that this was the best achieved objective of the retreat. While 48 percent thought it was very well achieved, 45 percent thought it was well achieved and only 2.5 percent couldn't decide about it.

A. In your opinion, how well were the following desired outcomes achieved?

Outcome: 1. Reaffirm the purpose and shared vision of the California Literacy Campaign

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	34%	54%	5%	7%	0%	0%
Supervisors	55	45		0	0	0
Library Directors	54	41	0	2.5	0	2.5
CLSB Members	60	40	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	75	12.5	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	75	0	0	0	0
GROUP	48	45	2.5	3.5	0	1

In the first Program Effectiveness Review of the CLC, done in 1984, there was evidence that CLC participants did not have a shared understanding of the Campaign. In an effort to measure the degree of shared understanding at the retreat, a semantic differential scale was constructed. (This is a method for measuring the meaning of, or attitudes toward, concepts.) Polar adjective pairs anchor the scale. The concept chosen in this case was "the vision of the California Literacy Campaign".

The following tables indicate the most frequent ratings given by participants, by group, for each paired adjective.

timely							untimely
Coordinators	44%	39%	12%	5%	0%	0%	0%
Supervisors	68	27	5	0	0	0	0
Library Directors	43	41	8	8	0	0	0
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	62.5	37.5	0	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	50	0	0	0	0	0
GROUP	51	37	8	4	0	0	0

strong							weak
Coordinators	12%	29%	22%	17%	15%	0%	5%
Supervisors	4.5	45.5	36.5	9	4.5	0	0
Library Directors	30	38	8	11	5	5	0
CLSB Members	40	40	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	50	37.5	0	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	0	0	25	0
GROUP	20.5	36.5	18	12	7.5	2.5	2

clear							confusing
Coordinators	17%	34%	19.5%	15%	7%	5%	2.5%
Supervisors	9	41	9	18	9	9	5
Library Directors	11	41	19	19	5	5	0
CLSB Members	20	60	0	0	20	0	0
State Library Staff	25	37.5	25	0	12.5	0	0
Not Self-Identified							
GROUP	15	38.5	16	15.5	8	5	2

realistic							unrealistic
Coordinators	2%	22%	17%	34%	15%	5%	5%
Supervisors	4.5	32	22.5	41	0	0	0
Library Directors	0	11	32	38	14	2.5	2.5
CLSB Members	20	60	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	37.5	37.5	12.5	0	0	12.5	0
Not Self-Identified	0	50	25	25	0	0	0
GROUP	5	24	23	32	9	4	3

flexible							rigid
Coordinators	20%	44%	10%	15%	5%	2%	2%
Supervisors	13.5	54.5	0	23	9	0	0
Library Directors	32	30	24	11	3	0	0
CLSB Members	40	40	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	37.5	37.5	25	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	0	25	25	0	0	0
GROUP	26	39	14.5	13.5	4	1	1

important								unimportant
Coordinators	59%	34%	5%	2%	0%	0%	0%	
Supervisors	36	55	9	0	0	0	0	
Library Directors	54	24	19	3	0	0	0	
CLSB Members	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	
State Library Staff	50	37.5	12.5	0	0	0	0	
Not Self-Identified	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	
GROUP	54	34	10	2	0	0	0	

complete								incomplete
Coordinators	2.5%	12%	29%	22%	22%	10%	2.5%	
Supervisors	0	18	31.5	18	14	14	4.5	
Library Directors	3	22	27	24	14	5	5	
CLSB Members	20	40	20	0	0	20	0	
State Library Staff	0	37.5	50	12.5	0	0	0	
Not Self-Identified	0	50	0	25	25	0	0	
GROUP	3	20.5	29	20.5	15	8.5	3.5	

good								bad
Coordinators	39%	41.5%	12%	2.5%	2.5%	0%	0%	
Supervisors	41	45.5	9	4.5	0	0	0	
Library Directors	51	30	8	11	0	0	0	
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0	0	
State Library Staff	62.5	25	12.5	0	0	0	0	
Not Self-Identified	0	25	25	25	0	25	0	
GROUP	46	37	9	5	2	0	0	

simple								complicated
Coordinators	7%	2%	17%	27%	20%	12%	15%	
Supervisors	4.5	18	4.5	23	23	13.5	13.5	
Library Directors	5	11	30	21.5	13.5	8	11	
CLSB Members	20	0	40	20	20	0	0	
State Library Staff	25	12.5	12.5	25	0	25	0	
Not Self-Identified	0	0	0	50	25	25	0	
GROUP	7.5	8.5	19	25	17	12	11	

new								old
Coordinators	7%	20%	24%	41.5%	2.5%	0%	2.5%	
Supervisors	4.5	23	18	32	9	0	0	
Library Directors	13.5	35	19	30	2.5	0	0	
CLSB Members	20	20	60	0	0	0	0	
State Library Staff	25	37.5	25	12.5	0	0	0	
Not Self-Identified	0	25	25	25	0	25	0	
GROUP	10	26	23	32	3.5	1	1	

Note: On this and the preceding page, not all responses per group total 100%. In all such cases, the "missing percentage" reflects the no response answers.

The degree to which the vision of the CLC is shared similarly by such diverse groups of participants is indeed outstanding. The groups' understandings of the purpose of the Campaign are probably even more similar. All the groups found the vision of the CLC to be strong, timely, clear, flexible, important and good. All groups expressed the same hesitancy about how realistic the CLC was. They also agreed that the CLC was neither simple nor complicated. The new/old pair, while receiving the same ratings as simple/complicated, probably was a meaningless pair and should be disregarded.

A key word in this objective was "vision." While the word was used quite often during the retreat, there was a noticeable lack of "visioning" attempted. That is, most disucssions were short-range in scope, rather than attempting to look five or ten years into the future. This is particularly significant, given the retreat's major objective: to "develop a shared, agreed-upon vision of the direction and purpose of the Campaign over the next five years..."

2. Identify how Adult Literacy and Learning Programs can Become a part of Public Library Services

While 32 percent of participants thought this was a very well achieved objective and half of them felt it was well achieved, 11 percent were undecided:

Outcome: 2. Identify how adult literacy and learning programs can become a part of public library services

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	37%	41%	10%	12%	0%	0%
Supervisors	50	45	5	0	0	0
Library Directors	16	57	19	8	0	0
CLSB Members	60	40	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	25	62.5	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	75	0	0	0	0
GROUP	32	50	11	7	0	0

The facilitators alertly recognized this as two questions in one--how has literacy already become part of library services and how <u>can</u> literacy become integrated into public library services? There were several interpretations of what to integrate literacy <u>into</u> in libraries. Some interpreted "a part of public library services" to mean part of special or outreach services such as Children's, Reference or Young Adult; others identified anything at all that linked libraries and literacy, such as certificates of appreciation to tutors and CLC staff on city payroll. Perhaps it would have been clearer, more accurate and a bit

more useful to have worded the expected outcome more broadly.

Another problem with the wording of the outcome was the phrase "and learning programs" which either had no meaning for, or was totally ignored by, the small groups.

The wealth of ideas and experiences shared in this discussion should be put into a popularly-written format and made available to CLC staff and to out-of-state libraries inquiring about the Campaign.

3. Reaffirm the roles of the California State Library and of public libraries in the California Literacy Campaign

This was the least achieved outcome of the retreat, participants indicated. Only 20.5 percent ranked its achievement as very well, while 30 percent said well and 30.5 percent were undecided.

Outcome: 3. Reaffirm the roles of the CSL and of public libraries in the California Literacy Campaign

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	17%	32%	34%	15%	0%	0%
Supervisors	23	50	18	9	0	0
Library Directors	16	35	41	5	0	3
CLSB Members	40	60	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	25	37.5	25	12.5	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	25	25	0	0	0
GROUP	20.5	38	30.5	9	0	2

There probably were several contributing factors to the comparatively lower rating for this outcome: no small-group sessions were devoted exclusively to this topic; although it was reflected in several groups' priority issues, less time was devoted to discussing it than other issues; and when it was most directly addressed--in the State Librarian's closing remarks--came <u>after</u> participants had written their evaluations. (See the agenda in Chapter II and Strong's closing remarks in this chapter's appendix.)

More clarification of roles of State Library Consultants and types of technical assistance provided by the State Library seems to be needed by many literacy project participants.

A different type of involvement of State Library staff at the retreat might have overcome some of the lack of clarity indicated by participant responses. For example, the State Librarian might have had a question and answer session with participants on Thursday evening. Perhaps ways could have been found to discuss the roles of Literacy Specialists in a

team-building atmosphere. In what ways can State Library Regional Consultants become more informed about, and more contributors to, the CLC?

4. Share What We have Learned from our Experiences in the California Literacy Campaign

This got the highest very well achieved rating--61.2 percent, while 30 percent thought it was well achieved and only 5 percent were undecided. A look at the individual group ratings is significant: every group except for the "not self-identified" gave this outcome their highest ratings. As a group, the State Library staff seemed most appreciative (87.5 percent). This is a very strong re-affirmation of CLC participants' need to know what is happening across the state and throughout the Campaign.

Outcome: 4. Share what we have learned from our experiences in the California Literacy Campaign

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	56%	37%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Supervisors	64	27	0	4.5	0	4.5
Library Directors	60	30	5	5	0	0
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	87.5	0	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	25	0	0
GROUP	61.5	30	5	2.5	0	1

5. Identify Key Issues and Possible Options for Addressing those Issues

While 38 percent of the participants thought this outcome was achieved very well and 44 percent said well, 9 percent were undecided.

Outcome: 5. Identify key issues and possible options for addressing those issues

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	34%	54%	2%	10%	0%	0%
Supervisors	41	45	14	0	0	0
Library Directors	41	32	13.5	11	0	2.5
CLSB Members	60	20	20	0	0	0
State Library Staff	37.5	50	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	25	0	0
GROUP	38	44	9	8	0	1

More significant, however, is the fact that 10 percent of the coordinators ranked it poorly. A look at their expectations for the retreat (their "need to know" and to

have some specific examples of what's working) and at their evaluations explains their concerns. For example:

> Too abstract; I'd have liked more of a "let's develop an action plan" style.
>
> No concrete answers; just a lot of talk.
>
> We could have devoted more time to concentrating on the key issues and less time on reflecting
>
> Identifying ideas in a too-short period of time (12 minutes) and not having enough time to really deal with them. Just a list is helpful but limited.
>
> Frustration about not enough time to discuss "key issues".
>
> An inordinate amount of time was spent on Thursday (in small groups) airing problems and issues, with a disproportionately small amount of time spent on possible solutions/directions to take on these same problems/issues

Although they may have ranked this outcome's achievement higher than coordinators did, persons in other groups had similar criticisms. For example, library directors said:

> Not specific enough action planning--not enough time to adequately address issues/concerns and options for addressing.
>
> Overemphasis on celebration of success; not enough focus on hard problems or failures.
>
> Lack of time or ideas about the vision for the future.
>
> Not enough new information or planning was done together.
>
> More formalized opportunities to discuss program specifics.
>
> Disappointed not to leave with a clear strategy for future state-level action--not enough time.

Participant Evaluation of Specific Retreat Segments

Questions B1 through B8 on the evaluation (see appendix) asked participants to rate the degree of helpfulness of

Recommendations

Based upon the above observations, plus the excellent answers given by all participant groups (see the appendix), plus the evaluator's own experiences in national adult literacy efforts, the following recommendations are made:

1. Sponsor or enable a series of one-topic seminars or workshops for CLC public library teams on the priority issues identified in the retreat.

It is important that such sessions be working sessions, the end result of which is a definite plan of action for each library.

One approach would be to enable library groups who have experienced success in a priority-issue area to conduct workshops or seminars on the given topic. State Library staff could then help attendees adapt workshop learnings to their individual situations.

2. Schedule a retreat open to the same participants to focus solely on long-range planning and visioning for the future.

Such an event could "take up where this event left off". Outside facilitators and recorders would again be helpful, but the excellent suggestions made by participants regarding large and small group sessions should be consulted in setting the agenda schedule.

3. Seek more channels to communicate the successes of individual programs to all CLC participants.

More frequent, popularly written newsletters would be one possible help. They should contain lots of how-to's and specifics. Perhaps a CLC "nitty-gritty" type handbook for coordinators of new CLC projects would also be helpful. Its examples and suggestions could be drawn from the experiences of other CLC programs.

4. Seek to identify allies at statewide and community levels who are involved in working for positive change, so that communities might begin to work on preventive literacy as well as direct service to the educationally disadvantaged.

For example, many churches and civic organizations are taking a hard look at the way the systems in our society work. A year ago, the Lutheran Church in America sponsored a "systems change" conference. It considered basic

pre-retreat mailings, various working portions of the retreat, the physical setting and the retreat in general.

The pre-retreat mailings received the most mixed reviews, although 25.5 percent found them very helpful and 54 percent said they were helpful. It was hardly a surprise to find that 83.5 percent found the beautiful Asilomar oceanside setting helpful.

Both the Wednesday and Thursday addresses by the State Librarian were well received and considered about equally helpful (30 and 28 very helpful and 49.5 and 54.5 percent helpful respectively). Although it was not included on the written evaluation, participants seemed to find the closing remarks much more helpful, possibly because they directly answered comments and questions raised by the group during the retreat.

Participants preferred the small peer groups defined by their job descriptions to either the small public library team groups or the large group feedback sessions. The consensus seemed to be that participants were not in public library teams long enough and/or the wrong subject was assigned to the library team groups.

Many participants found the large group feedback sessions to be unduly repetitious and handicapped by lack of opportunity for open discussion of reported-out issues and concerns.

Participants especially appreciated the opportunities for informal meetings (provided by 45-minute breaks and a non-scheduled evening). The ratings of such opportunities were 50.5 percent very helpful and 39 percent helpful.

Forty-six percent gave the retreat a general/overall rating of very helpful and 41 percent said helpful. Eighty-eight percent fel that the retreat was valuable enough to be repeated, but 21.5 percent of library directors went against the tide and said it wasn't.

education as a justice issue. This year the church sponsored a national conference on coalition-building. The AAUW is one of many groups to give special consideration to literacy in its study of women's rights. Such groups seek ways to diagnose root causes of societal problems, then develop strategies for changing the systems that caused the unjust and undesirable situations.

It is no secret that something is wrong with the nation's educational systems. Groups such as the ones mentioned above have developed or are developing advocacy, public information and watchdog skills. Explore ways of helping such groups think of literacy as a justice issue which has a direct link to many other issues such as hunger, homelessness and so on. Then help them to know what issues CLC has uncovered about literacy upon which they could act.

Evaluation Form

THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT
February 25-27, 1987

A. In your opinion, how well were the following desired outcomes achieved? (Check one answer for each objective.)

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All
1. Reaffirm the purpose and shared vision of the California Literacy Campaign	___	___	___	___	___
2. Identify how adult literacy and learning programs can become a part of public library services	___	___	___	___	___
3. Reaffirm the roles of the California State Library and of public libraries in the California Literacy Campaign	___	___	___	___	___
4. Share what we have learned from our experiences in the California Literacy Campaign	___	___	___	___	___
5. Identify key issues and possible options for addressing those issues	___	___	___	___	___

B. How helpful to you, personally, were the following:

	Very Helpful		Undecided	A little	Not
1. Pre-Retreat mailings	___	___	___	___	___
2. Keynote address by Strong (Wed. pm)	___	___	___	___	___
3. The physical setting (Asilomar)	___	___	___	___	___
4. Purpose and vision of the CLC by Strong	___	___	___	___	___
5. Small peer groups (Thurs.)	___	___	___	___	___
5a. Small Public Library Team groups (Fri.)	___	___	___	___	___
6. Large Group feedback sessions	___	___	___	___	___
7. Opportunities for informal meetings	___	___	___	___	___
8. The retreat in general/overall	___	___	___	___	___

C. Please rate the vision of the California Literacy Campaign as you perceive it or feel about it at this moment by placing an X somewhere along each line between the paired words.

The Vision of the California Literacy Campaign

1.	timely	___	___	___	___	___	___	___ untimely
2.	weak	___	___	___	___	___	___	___ strong
3.	clear	___	___	___	___	___	___	___ confusing
4.	unrealistic	___	___	___	___	___	___	___ realistic

more

5.	flexible	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	rigid
6.	important	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	unimportant
7.	complete	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	incomplete
8.	good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	bad
9.	simple	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	complicated
10.	new	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	old

D. Based on your experience at this retreat, was the event valuable enough to be repeated? (check one)

1. YES _____

2. NO _____

E. What did you find most valuable about the retreat?

F. What was least valuable to you?

G. Other comments?

H. Please check which type of participant you were at this retreat:

1. _____ Public Library Director
2. _____ Supervisor of CLC Coordinator
3. _____ CLC Coordinator
4. _____ California Library Services Board Member
5. _____ State Library Staff
6. _____ Other (please specify) _____

I. For how long have you been in the above position? _____ year(s)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH for completing this evaluation.

ml/2-87

A. In your opinion, how well were the following desired outcomes achieved?

Outcome: 1. Reaffirm the purpose and shared vision the California Literacy Campaign

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	34%	54%	5%	7%	0%	0%
Supervisors	55	45		0	0	0
Library Directors	54	41	0	2.5	0	2.5
CLSB Members	60	40	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	75	12.5	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	75	0	0	0	0
GROUP	48	45	2.5	3.5	0	1

Outcome: 2. Identify how adult literacy and learning programs can become a part of public library services

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	37%	41%	10%	12%	0%	0%
Supervisors	50	45	5	0	0	0
Library Directors	16	57	19	8	0	0
CLSB Members	60	40	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	25	62.5	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	75	0	0	0	0
GROUP	32	50	11	7	0	0

Outcome: 3. Reaffirm the roles of the CSL and of public libraries in the California Literacy Campaign

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	17%	32%	34%	15%	0%	0%
Supervisors	23	50	18	9	0	0
Library Directors	16	35	41	5	0	3
CLSB Members	40	60	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	25	37.5	25	12.5	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	25	25	0	0	0
GROUP	20.5	38	30.5	9	0	2

Outcome: 4. Share what we have learned from our experiences in the California Literacy Campaign

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	56%	37%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Supervisors	64	27	0	4.5	0	4.5
Library Directors	60	30	5	5	0	0
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	87.5	0	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	25	0	0
GROUP	61.5	30	5	2.5	0	1

Outcome: 5. Identify key issues and possible options for addressing those issues

	Very Well	Well	Undecided	Poorly	Not at All	No Response
Coordinators	34%	54%	2%	10%	0%	0%
Supervisors	41	45	14	0	0	0
Library Directors	41	32	13.5	11	0	2.5
CLSB Members	60	20	20	0	0	0
State Library Staff	37.5	50	12.5	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	25	0	0
GROUP	38	44	9	8	0	1

B1. How helpful to you were the Pre-Retreat Mailings?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	27%	53.5%	5%	14.5%	0%	0%
Supervisors	23	59	4.5	13.5	0	0
Library Directors	27	54	2.7	10.9	2.7	2.7
CLSB Members	40	40	0	0	0	20
State Library Staff	12.5	50	12.5	12.5	12.5	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	0	0	25
GROUP	25.5	54	4	12	2	2.5

B2. How helpful to you was the Keynote Address by Strong (Wed. pm)?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	27%	56%	7.5%	7.5%	2%	0%
Supervisors	23	55	13	4.5	0	4.5
Library Directors	30	40.5	5.5	16	0	8
CLSB Members	20	80	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	87.5	12.5	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	25	0	25	0	0
GROUP	30	49.5	7.5	9	1	3

B3. How helpful to you was the Physical Setting (Asilomar)?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	81%	17%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Supervisors	91	9	0	0	0	0
Library Directors	81	16	3	0	0	0
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	100	0	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	75	25	0	0	0	0
GROUP	83.5	14.5	1	0	1	0

B4. How helpful to you was Strong's presentation on the Purpose and Vision of the CLC?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	22%	61%	5%	10%	2%	0%
Supervisors	27	64	4.5	4.5	0	0
Library Directors	24	51	5.5	11	3	5.5
CLSB Members	40	60	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	87.5	12.5	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	25	0	25	0	0
GROUP	28	54.5	6	7.5	2	2

B5. How helpful to you were the Small Peer Groups (Thurs.)?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	44%	39%	2.5%	12%	2.5%	0%
Supervisors	55	45	0	0	0	0
Library Directors	27	43	16	11	0	3
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	37.5	62.5	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	25	0	0	0
GROUP	41	42.5	7	7.5	1	1

B5a. How helpful to you were the Small Public Library Team Groups (Fri.)?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	32%	46%	0%	20%	2%	0%
Supervisors	27.5	50	9	4.5	4.5	4.5
Library Directors	19	48.5	8	11	11	2.5
CLSB Members	60	40	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	25	50	0	12.5	0	12.5
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	0	0	25
GROUP	27.5	48	4	12	5	3.5

B6. How helpful to you were the Large Group Feedback Sessions?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	22%	49%	5%	9.5%	5%	9.5%
Supervisors	32	50	4.5	9	0	4.5
Library Directors	16	62	8	14	0	0
CLSB Members	20	80	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	37.5	12.5	25	12.5	0	12.5
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	25	0	0
GROUP	23	52	7	11	2	5

B7. How helpful to you were the Opportunities for Informal Meetings?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	56%	39%	2.5%	2.5%	0%	0%
Supervisors	63.5	32	0	4.5	0	0
Library Directors	30	51	5	8	3	3
CLSB Members	80	0	0	20	0	0
State Library Staff	75	12.5	0	0	0	12.5
Not Self-Identified	50	25	0	25	0	0
GROUP	50.5	39	2.5	5	1	2

B8. How helpful to you was the Retreat in General/Overall?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Undecided	A Little	Not Helpful	No Response
Coordinators	37%	51%	5%	7%	0%	0%
Supervisors	54.5	32	9	0	0	4.5
Library Directors	38	46	5	8	0	3
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0
State Library Staff	87.5	12.5	0	0	0	0
Not Self-Identified	50	25	0	25	0	0
GROUP	46	41	5	6	0	2

C. Please rate the vision of the California Literacy Campaign as you perceive it or feel about it at this moment by placing an X somewhere along each line between the paired words.

THE VISION OF THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

timely								untimely	No Response
Coordinators	44%	39%	12%	5%	0%	0%	0%		0%
Supervisors	68	27	5	0	0	0	0		0
Library Directors	43	41	8	8	0	0	0		0
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	62.5	37.5	0	0	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	50	50	0	0	0	0	0		0
GROUP	51	37	8	4	0	0	0		0

strong								weak	No Response
Coordinators	12%	29%	22%	17%	15%	0%	5%		0%
Supervisors	4.5	45.5	36.5	9	4.5	0	0		0
Library Directors	30	38	8	11	5	5	0		3
CLSB Members	40	40	20	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	50	37.5	0	12.5	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	25	50	0	0	0	25	0		0
GROUP	20.5	36.5	18	12	7.5	2.5	2		1

clear								confusing	No Response
Coordinators	17%	34%	19.5%	15%	7%	5%	2.5%		0%
Supervisors	9	41	9	18	9	9	5		0
Library Directors	11	41	19	19	5	5	0		0
CLSB Members	20	60	0	0	20	0	0		0
State Library Staff	25	37.5	25	0	12.5	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified									
GROUP	15	38.5	16	15.5	8	5	2		0

realistic								unrealistic	No Response
Coordinators	2%	22%	17%	34%	15%	5%	5%		0%
Supervisors	4.5	32	22.5	41	0	0	0		0
Library Directors	0	11	32	38	14	2.5	2.5		0
CLSB Members	20	60	20	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	37.5	37.5	12.5	0	0	12.5	0		0
Not Self-Identified	0	50	25	25	0	0	0		0
GROUP	5	24	23	32	9	4	3		0

flexible								rigid	No Response
Coordinators	20%	44%	10%	15%	5%	2%	2%		2%
Supervisors	13.5	54.5	0	23	9	0	0		0
Library Directors	32	30	24	11	3	0	0		0
CLSB Members	40	40	20	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	37.5	37.5	25	0	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	50	0	25	25	0	0	0		0
GROUP	26	39	14.5	13.5	4	1	1		1

	important							unimportant	No Response
Coordinators	59%	34%	5%	2%	0%	0%	0%		0%
Supervisors	36	55	9	0	0	0	0		0
Library Directors	54	24	19	3	0	0	0		0
CLSB Members	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	50	37.5	12.5	0	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	50	50	0	0	0	0	0		0
GROUP	54	34	10	2	0	0	0		0

	complete							incomplete	No Response
Coordinators	2.5%	12%	29%	22%	22%	10%	2.5%		0%
Supervisors	0	18	31.5	18	14	14	4.5		0
Library Directors	3	22	27	24	14	5	5		0
CLSB Members	20	40	20	0	0	20	0		0
State Library Staff	0	37.5	50	12.5	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	0	50	0	25	25	0	0		0
GROUP	3	20.5	29	20.5	15	8.5	3.5		0

	good							bad	No Response
Coordinators	39%	41.5%	12%	2.5%	2.5%	0%	0%		2.5%
Supervisors	41	45.5	9	4.5	0	0	0		0
Library Directors	51	30	8	11	0	0	0		0
CLSB Members	80	20	0	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	62.5	25	12.5	0	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	0	25	25	25	0	25	0		0
GROUP	46	37	9	5	2	0	0		1

	simple							complicated	No Response
Coordinators	7%	2%	17%	27%	20%	12%	15%		0%
Supervisors	4.5	18	4.5	23	23	13.5	13.5		0
Library Directors	5	11	30	21.5	13.5	8	11		0
CLSB Members	20	0	40	20	20	0	0		0
State Library Staff	25	12.5	12.5	25	0	25	0		0
Not Self-Identified	0	0	0	50	25	25	0		0
GROUP	7.5	8.5	19	25	17	12	11		0

	new							old	No Response
Coordinators	7%	20%	24%	41.5%	2.5%	0%	2.5%		2.5%
Supervisors	4.5	23	18	32	9	0	0		13.5
Library Directors	13.5	35	19	30	2.5	0	0		0
CLSB Members	20	20	60	0	0	0	0		0
State Library Staff	25	37.5	25	12.5	0	0	0		0
Not Self-Identified	0	25	25	25	0	25	0		0
GROUP	10	26	23	32	3.5	1	1		3.5

D. Was the event [the retreat] valuable enough to be repeated?

	Yes	No	No Response
Coordinators	95%	2.5%	2.5%
Supervisors	91	4.5	4.5
Library Directors	75.5	21.5	3
CLSB Members	80	20	0
State Library Staff	100	0	0
Not Self-Identified	100	0	0
GROUP	88	9.5	2.5

Appendix VIII-c

COORDINATORS' OPEN-ENDED EVALUATIONS

E. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST VALUABLE ABOUT THE RETREAT?

- meeting with others in the campaign, finding out that we are each unique, we are all very similar; the networking and supportive (mutual) atmosphere was inspiring.
- session with library administration as to integration. avenues of exchange opened with colleagues, facilitators and directors; opportunity to explore different approaches to same program in a variety of settings.
- being able to get together in relaxed atmosphere with colleagues and supervisors. networking with other providers; attaching faces to names; meeting Library directors; learning about similarities and differences between various programs.
- knowing State library "hopes" for some level of funding and my library's plans to totally integrate me (CLC Coordinator) into the library.
- the opportunity to see what other programs are doing and how they are solving similar problems to our own programs.
- opportunity to network with other CLC participants; hearing many ideas ... some we will implement. Reaffirmation that what our program is experiencing many other programs are also experiencing.
- mostly the sharing of ideas, what'shappening in different programs; lots of creativity and a shared vision and commitment.
- while we have had an opportunity to share local and regional concerns with other CLC plarticipants, this was our first chan e to do so with all participants. Plus we were able to hear and see conviction for concerns of library administrators, too. Information exchange, resource sharing personalized.
- finding people in the same local situation - helpful to discuss how they handle similar problems.
- interaction with my roomate. Paul and Al. Thursday night informal gathering.
- Validation of literacy as: as 1) important issue State-wide and 2) as a permanent, "real" library service.
- sharing day to day ideas with other coordinators from different geographical areas; sharing training, visions, contradictions.
- for the Supervisor and Director to hear what we as coordinators have been telling them from other voices. Regular support for me from State - via newsletters; sharing positive problem solving techniques would be helpful in dealing with Library staff.
- funding options; what libraries/literacy programs are doing to become integrated; networking with peers, CSL Board

members, State Library staff; ideal setting (no phones, television) quiet and conducive to working.

- the opportunity to share and receive new ideas with other coordinators regarding better ways to run our programs. Also, alytime you get all your specialists in one setting at any time, many new ideas arise to help us all.
- informal conversations; getting library directors to buy in; R & R.
- the ideas and energy generated. I hope the focus is not that we should only take the ideas to our local areas, but that the State Library will see many ideas as directed to them. It was valuable to be able to communicate to the groups and listen to them. I only hope we are heard.
- forced library administrators to focus on literacy (period).
- Hearing experiences of "seasoned" coordinators.
- the exchange of ideas, but perhaps the opportunity for all levels (coordinators, directors, supervisors and State) to interact about thkeir concerns and to objectively work on possible solutions.
- hearing what the library directors had to say about making literacy a part of the overall library services (integrate) especially in the funding issue. It is helpful to hear if they value literacy and really plan on backing up literacy by seeking funding. Sometimes it has been unclear (in the past) whether they are committed to having literacy service continue or whether we will end when the grant ends.
- Sharing of ideas - meeting colleagues - knowing we all have similar problems; obtaining new ideas to try. The facilities were marvelous.
- Networking, sharing ideas, learning more about different programs and possibilities. Learning about the library directors' feeling for literacy as a library service; getting to learn more about and to personally meet the CLSB Board members.
- Library coordinator, State interaction.
- Networking
- The sharing of ideas; the appreciation of the individuality of each program and especially the opportunity to participate with supervisors and directors.
- The networking and sharing of information not only with other CLC coordinators, but also with other library staff and board members.
- Communication both formal and informal between Program Coordinator and Supervisor. Recognition of differences among library funding and political base e.g. small, large; urban-rural.
- the chance to let the program assistant be responsible for running the office unaided will be valuable experience for her. The chance to socialize with peers did much to improve my outlook.
- ability for individuals to gain strength from the group; to present real and personal feelings and concerns to State Library Personnel.

- the ten minutes spent on long-term funding solutions on Friday morning. Plus networking between sessions.
- sharing ideas and information with other programs. Exploring possible solutions to common problems; meeting people from other programs.
- the opportunity to interact with other coordinators; and hopefully, an increase in committment to literacy by the Library Directors.
- Networking; having supervisors hear what other CLC libraries are doing that we don't.
- getting the overall perspectives and realities from other libraries.
- sharing experiences and concerns.
- interaction between peers; sharing ideas.
- sharing concerns.
- the relaxation.

F. WHAT WAS LEAST VALUABLE TO YOU?

- I'm not sure - a concern - what are we going to do now?
- Repetition of ideas.
- Seemed to be a lot of repetition - some things said over and over again, in different ways.
- some content was too abstract; I'd have liked more of a "let's develop an action plan" style.
- Thursday morning small group questions from State - 1 and 3 were too similar.
- The fact that there were no concrete answers, just a lot of talk. Plus not knowing what will be the final outcome of retreat; will changes be made? Will suggestions be taken seriously? What will the "State" do will all the paper generated at retreat?
- I feel we could have devoted more time to concentrating on the key issues and less time on reflecting. Also what we learned in the CLC the Thursday afternoon session seemed a bit rushed and this was the real "meat" of the retreat.
- some hesitancy on part of State library administration to push for network of library system efforts which may be the most practical way to go in some cases.
- small meeting with Directors, Supervisors and Coordinators.
- Unfortunately the sessions which were rigid, much time wasted in trying to prepare charts, unresponsive.
- All valuable.
- identifying ideas in a too short period of time (12 Minutes) and not having enough time to really deal with them. Just a list is helpful but limited.
- The social hours - we needed more free time and to know that that time was available beforehand so that we could plan to meet.
- more male facililtators - seemed unbalanced with just women, though all did a fine job.
- Nothing

- no new ideas from small or large group sessions.
- When small money ideas were presented I felt it was counter-productive in the large group. I overheard Directors shifting to the Coordinators to say, why don't you do that or that? It gave them an out to their own commitment. It would have been more appropriate in coordinators group with Directors planning strategies to incorporate literacy as a library service.
- Why waste time on issues - was it really a surprise to "discover" that funding is #1 on everyone's minds?
- having to be discreet and not candid about problems in program due to presence of Supervisors and Library Director who do not want problem issues discussed among "others".
- Generally quite good. Frustration about not enough time to discuss "key issues". Sometimes difficult to agree or understand meaning of question.
- Sessions that were redundant; Issues (like funding) that were too general and not discussed specifically.
- Meetings with Director and Coordinators together leads to conventional, smothered, proper output.
- excessive concentration on the funding issue, which is not our primary concern.
- This is difficult to identify. I was able to have a meaningful experience through the retreat.
- Large group fundraising idea exchange. Became a show and tell, rather than problem solving session.
- Having a content-less agenda repeatedly reviewed, written on posters, and typed on sheets included in the packet was senseless.
- Friday morning integration discussion - much of it centered on issues not al all related to my situation.
- an inordinate amount of time was spent on Thursday (in small groups) airing problems and issues, with a disproportionately small amount of time spent on possible solutions/directions to take on these saame problems/issues.
- the large group reports on Friday.
- large groups not always helpful; did not like the way "funding" discussion became a one-ups-manship! NOT the right idea!
- the small peer group sessions covered much of the ground already trodden by our local library literacy network. Would like to have had something new and fresh.
- overly scheduled - too many topics!
- large group sessions.
- large group - no discussion was allowed.
- the large group reports.

G. OTHER COMMENTS?
- what is to be done with the information? will this enliven the CLC and give new energy and focus or is this our work?
-would have been nice to have a planned event on Thursday night; "open mike" didn't work.
-I'm tired.

-I'm MOST impressed with the EXCELLENT organization of this whole experience; realizing this was a first experience for all of us, I think it has been most beneficial; let's do it again; SOON!

-Let's call CLC Coordinators Directors--title is so important in opening doors in the community.

-Overall it was a good retreat; I think it should take place again and make sure it included concrete answers to questions they foresee being asked; send a questionnaire out beforehand and address the 5-10 top questions with definite answers; we need examples, not just theory.

-pleasant, enjoyable, relaxing, an opportunity to reflect

-It would have been nice to ban smoking in all buildings, ESPECIALLY in Heather;smokers Thursday night forced others who needed to breathe to leave; this interfered with networking efforts and socializing.

-enjoyed it, maintains unity of campaign; good for followup on other program/coordinators strengths, as well as innovations.

-outstanding site; beyond evaluation of retreat .... expectations are raised--now what?

-Marti is great; Marilyn Snider's girls have such a positive and friendly attitude; enjoyed Kathy and Sally very much.

-the facilitation by outside the Campaign people was most effective and appreciated

-great location; excellent facilitators

-would have enjoyed some planned social activities Wednesday and Thursday night, to facilitate the "networking."

-layout of Asilimar was confusing and meeting rooms too small, although setting is incomparable

-Facilitators did an EXCELLENT job of keeping groups on task. This was perhaps the element that really made the retreat a success. The real success, however, will be what happens down the road as a result of this exchange.

-our room arrangements were completly flubbed

-the staff tried hard to deal with all the quirks of the group--great accommodations

-I could have waited till after Gary Strong's final comments to evaluate the WHOLE retreat because I feel that his remarks are going to fill a big void or answer a lot of questions that I think HE will best answer.

-excellent facilitators and recorders kept us on track and validated the diversity of our programs

-Thank you very much for the opportunity; let's do it again!

-Outstanding process.

-Someone suggested some meetings in very small groups, such as five people; this would be a valuable addition.

-The retreat could have included another day--many very critical issues were put forward and recorded with quite inadequate thought or consideration.

-As with most conferences, the informal networking was the most valuable, but the experience was, overall, very helpful to a new person.
-good food, accommodations, outstanding facilitators and assistants
-good use of space and time
-very good, enjoyable, informative, thought-provoking retreat
-probably should have BEEN RESTRICTED to the topic of funding--which is the major concern
-people who set this up did an excellent job; "Hats off" to the facilitators
-prefer intense, small-group workshops

Appendix VIII-d

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' OPEN-ENDED EVALUATIONS

E. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST VALUABLE ABOUT THE RETREAT?

- Interaction with colleagues.
- reaffirmation of the shared vision; opportunity to discuss ideas in a retreat setting; facilitators are a very important part of the process.
- experiences by similar type and size of libraries.
- some useful ideas; shared problems; uninterrupted discussions.
- shared visions (ideas) of individual programs.
- meetings with other library directors; hear common concerns; got my thinking "in gear" regarding long term issues that must be addressed now.
- seeing other people
- the intense interest of all participants and willingness to seek realistic solutions; well organized approach.
- the opportunity to completely focus on the CLC, on site, far-away with no distractions, interruptions, etc.
- sharing experiences with other libraries - hearing what they are doing.
- sharing with others. Recognizing statewide each community has to work out their problems.
- meeting the other participants in the literacy program.
- opinions of peers, and idea sharing.
- knowing and learning about problems other libraries face and identifying key issues
- sharing of ideas with other people, both involved and deeply involved.
- affirmation of programs; identified weakness and strengths of our program.
- Friday morning - large group specifics about major funding ideas; part of small group discussion about integrating service.
- finding out what other places are doing.
- sharing time; information on integration of programs; getting to know new people for future contacts.
- integrating literacy into regular library.
- the shared informal networking. Confirmation that our program was OK.
- Interaction with others.
- the opportunity to talk with colleagues of each kind and thereby: 1. get better acquainted, and 2. pick up useful ideas. The skills demonstrated by the facilitators. Outstanding!
- hear how others view program. However the great difference in libraries, funding and operations limits the real worth of this.
- Overall State picture of literacy projects. Views of the State libraries. Feeling by others that State Library consultants change from monitering activity to technical

support - fundraising at State level, training where needed at local level, etc. was the same as my concern. Ongoing funding could not be done entirely at local level. Ideas for services of fundraising; need for professionally produced public relations material.

- the focus on one topic. The pointed questions to be answered. The changing groups and the changing seating within the same group. Informal discussion with colleagues.
- identification of 5 key issues - similarity among groups identification of them. Recognition of need to set priorities - belief by some that library should become one of a series of partners in local coalitions and not primary provider. Possible funding by ABE of positions.
- being with dedicated people who share the same purposes and interest in literacy and be able to zero in on that subject and share!
- sharing ideas, meeting colleagues, brainstorming, solutions, sense of shared mission. Best session was small group library; literacy team approach to brainstorming how literacy can be merged with library budget.
- Informal discussions - enough time for them. Good facilitation that kept us on target. Being away from work to focus on this issue before the funding crunch comes.
- interchange of ideas.
- the opportunity to focus on one single important facet of public library service.
- sharing ideas, comparing specifics. Single focus of retreat, fabulous setting and weather.
- time to talk with others; opportunity for self and others to focus on literacy to exclusion of other issues.

F. WHAT WAS LEAST VALUABLE TO YOU?

- Not specific enough action planning - not enough time to adequately address issues/concerns and options for addressing (i.e. some specific steps and create foundation; develop statewide fund raising.)
- Nothing.
- listening to ideas, etc. that have little practical application with dwindling funds.
- groups produce ideas but not solutions.
- segregating groups on Thursday to directors, supervisors and coordinators; this segregation did not balance out the varying degrees of personal involvement of the participants in the individual literacy programs.
- reporting back from small groups; lots of repetition in small groups; I expected the getting together with own library staffs (Friday a.m.) would have been useful, but it was minimal. Probably would have been better to stick with Thursday groups.
- in an attempt to create a "common ground" way too much time was spent on hearing of everyone. Too much repetition because of large group size; over facilitation process took

over Future think about smaller groups that only come together for major speeches, etc; overemphasis on celebration of success; not enough focus on hard problems or failures; going around room for comment from everyone is tedious.

- some slack time.
- the Friday public library team group went on a bit too long. It became redundant - creative juices had dried up.
- would have liked more brainstorming and fewer small group (within groups) discussion.
- the way "C" above was formatted.
- facilitator named Kathy and recorder named Sally were a hindrance not a help. Anyone in the group could have done a better job as a volunteer. I nearly asked them to leave and take it over myself. They need extensive retraining.
- going around the room and introducing ourselves by saying what it all meaans for us to be here, etc. We dredge up generalizations and platitudes and the process takes FOREVER and nothing of substance is said. This particularly applied to the "Directors only" meetings; we all know each other and were not getting better acquainted during this.
- local revenues obtained. It was like a competition.
- Friday morning small groups.
- Thursday small groups - too general in focus.
- The long breaks, but I did like the time to walk around. There should have been a little more structure in the evening.
- lack of time or ideas about the vision for the future; the development of a strategy for increasing the resources for ($) for more success!
- the over-emphasis on the funding issue; no real discussion about the cause(s) of illiteracy.
- lack of clear future and commitment on many levels.
- a bit much of show and tell. No one came up with new ideas. A full day with Directors did not yield enough.
- All parts were useful. Facilitators were good, but didn't need to keep repeating their roles.
- the long breaks; the funding with focus mostly on one-time funds. It should have been targeted for long range.
- Small groups, but I realize these were essential to the development of information to report back.
- everything valuable - but each session seemed to get more valuable as it went along. More time should have been devoted to strategies for local funding.
- the time "going around the room" the first day. But, this did need to be done - perhaps not so often.
- Some of the people were most valuable - some of the people were least valuable.
- level of repetition in the reporting.
- mix of projects /libraries all at such different levels; fundraising idea - little $, much time. No long term answer.

G. OTHER COMMENTS?

- for me, not enough new information or planning was done together. I didn't learn much that I didn't already know. I feel affirmed, it's a nice explerience but was it really worth 2 1/2 days and 140 people? Did we use ourselves as resources as well as we could have?
- would like to have heard Marti Lane address the groups, the Library Director group, but if not possible, the Coordinator group.
- another approach might be to have Directors come for one day after front liners have had more time together.
- funding is the key issue that will have to be constantly emphasized (workshops, State level coordination, etc) as funding is cut back.
- Part C on this form didn't make any sense to me.
- I wish an elected official could have been present. Also a non-participating library! What a show.
- Thanks to Gary, CSL and Marilyn Snider for an outstanding experience. By being removed from my office, with my Literacy Team I was able to truly concentrate on our project for the first time in months.

Time was wasted in eliciting comments from each and every library director regarding expectations, etc.

-We must try to educate the "public" that literacy is a national problem and that funding will be needed Federal, State and local for the problem to be addressed.

-I still have serious concerns about the viabililty of local jurisdictions being able to absorb the cost of the necessary literacy personnel.

-the process takes FOREVER and nothing of substance is said. this particularly applied to the "Directors Only" meetings; we all know each other and were not getting better acquainted during this.

-liked the approach of sharing ideas rather than solutions or consensus (of flexibility)

-the facilitators--particularly Marilyn--were terrific!

-outstanding conference; setting beautiful; facilitators excellent

-outstanding location for retreat

-I would have enjoyed more formalized opportunities to discuss program specifics, especially fund-raising. Friday morning retrieved the retreat as far as usefulness to me as an individual library director. I wish that it could have happened sooner, giving me more time to follow up with individuals on the specific info that could not be covered in the large group.

-TVs are very nice to have; loved the setting

-can a future session involve "community" people so that financial and other resources can be mobilized for greater success! -good show!

-Program was well planned--single subject retreat is refreshing as opposed to annual CLA ALA conference; should be done more with more library issues; very professional facilitators!

-I would like to see a series of shorter retreats to address one specific problem, e.g. funding

-somewhat too regimented overall; late February is bad timing for some jurisdictions--budget time.

-would have liked to meet in discussion group with libraries our size; would like some sort of follow-up suggested by literacy person at State Library--perhaps in next 6 months will be visiting sites to help achieve identified objectives of the retreat; is literacy being viewed as this year's popular cause--I and R, automation were the last few years.

-The setting is great; the State Library should continue to support these single issue conferences--others could be on funding, LSCA grant directions, collection development.

-Disappointed not to leave with a clear strategy for future state-level action--not enough time--perhaps this was essential groundwork step needed before developing action plan at state level.

-wonderful setting!

-would like CSL staff to respond (incorporate in after event report) to the options voted under five most pressing problems.

-having the funding suggestions typed was terrific; not sure what you are asking in question C [on evaluation]

-I liked Marilyn--reminded me of a cute chipmunk! I appreciate your well intended effort and felt it very worthwhile.

-location was supurb!

-outstanding event--let's do it annually!

-facilitation was great! arrangements good.

Appendix VIII-e

STATE LIBRARY STAFF OPEN-ENDED EVALUATIONS

E. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST VALUABLE ABOUT THE RETREAT?

-exchange of ideas, meeting coordinators, supervisors
-extraordinarily talented group--very creative
-validation that the CLC makes sense
-chance to have major issues and options discussed by so many good thinkers--many creative ideas and solutions came up
-interaction among and between library staffs
-creating a shared CAMPAIGN
-opportunity to meet others involved in literacy

F. WHAT WAS LEAST VALUABLE TO YOU?

-summary sessions (they had value but less than direct)
-food was acceptable but definitely not exciting
-summary sessions, and loss of opportunity to work for enough time as public library teams
-can't say anything was least valuable; all aspects of agenda had some value.
-summary Thursday afternoon--misrepresenting situation--issue of 3 people becomes representative of 25; Friday first session--laundry list misdirects people to see fundraising as panacea; gave wrong message; total collection not 2% of $4 million.
-local team work groups--not enough

G. OTHER COMMENTS?

-TOO BAD to have paid Marti Lane for being here during retreat and NOT USE her considerable talents. She could, and should, have contributed to retreat.
-Wonderful experience; renewed my energy, enthusiasm and commitment to the Campaign.
-little chance to voice how one feels about what's happening
-one facilitator/recorder team was noticeably weaker than others, needed more training

Appendix VIII-f

SUPERVISORS' OPEN-ENDED EVLAUATIONS

E. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST VALUABLE ABOUT THE RETREAT?

-meeting and talking to people from other areas of the state; hearing the commitment of libraries to literacy

-I have to learn from others...especially the coordinators

-sharing ideas and discussing problems with people having common concerns was the most valuable. The informal times were most useful

-an opportunity to share/learn from my peer group. Have felt my ideas on incorporating Literacy were resented--have better understanding and perspective now

-interaction with others, sharing of ideas, chance to spend 3 days with director

-sharing ideas & problems--meeting with other Supervisors--use of facilitators--openness. Thursday meetings

-Getting away from daily distractions in order to think only about the program. Networking

-This was my only chance as a supervisor to see our program in relation to many other programs. Saw where we were "ahead" and where we're "behind." Know what to concentrate on now. Have a much clearer picture of interaction of Library Directors/Literacy Coordinators in other libraries. Can now place ours in perspective--will help daily activities

-Contacts with people; re-affirmation of role library plays with CLC; helps to talk with consultants

-exchange of ideas, especially with those in my peer group

-meeting individually with literacy campaign people from other parts of the state. Meeting in small groups with people of the same level of involvement; e.g., supervisors. Going away with knowledge that there is statewide commitment to the campaign which is strong persuasion locally

-The opportunity to be heard by (and to hear) all the different levels of Management of CLC, especially CLSB. The ideas, sharing, etc. R & R. Feelings of group cohesiveness and solidarity were very supportive and helpful.

-Networking--sharing experiences, defining, making distinction--the beach, the ocean, wine, friendship, affirmation

-Options offered; ideas shared

-The opportunity to talk to Southern California participants. To talk with BALIS members at greater length

-time to focus exclusively on literacy exchange of ideas, networking, excellent structure and facilitating; fast-moving, varied flow of ideas, concise information, clear focus

-well planned agenda, enjoyed small groups in large groups, enjoyed free time for networking

-Talking to individuals about their solutions to problems, exchange of funding ideas, chance to be open and express our real concerns to all levels (including CLSB and State Library) about the future

-shared ways of integrating literacy program into regular library services

-all the ideas that were generated in the small group and reports from other groups; informal exchange of ideas with other participants

-opportunity to focus on need for library administrators to carry more of the burden of the literacy projects

-identifying common goals, concerns, options; bringing about unity of purpose

F. WHAT WAS LEAST VALUABLE TO YOU?

-answering the 3 questions posed on Thursday morning

-Thursday afternoon small group projects

-I would have like to have had more scheduled time to communicate with own library team--perhaps 15-30 minutes each day

-not clear to participants what services are to be library-supported after 5 years

-Friday morning small group

-some of the group discussions; groups were TOLD what to discuss by predetermined "questions".

-"meeting" late evening on Thursday; very little literacy work accomplished in Heather with wine

-waste putting dissimilar size programs together/meant some concerns overpowered other smaller (and simpler) issues. I have no concept of what the effect of losing $65,000 funding is like since our entire program is less than that--a breakdown by size or type of program may have proven more useful to me

-Right now, it seems that everything was valuable

-Free evening on Thursday. Perhaps an optional, but structured, event would have been helpful. Large group meetings--the group summaries were useful--the meetings might have been a bit shorter is all

-Lack in-depth analysis on issues. Opening on Wednesday evening--should have had either Q & A period, or speeches by others, or open mike and something--or have begun thursday a.m. Lack of give and take with some CLC management, especially Gary Strong

-Cold shower Thuursday a.m.

-Friday morning's discussion

-Talk about fund raising. Discussion of three ice-breaker questions Thursday a.m.

-excessive concern about funding at local level and pressure on state library to continue full funding. Concept of decreasing funding has been clearly articulated from beginning of campaign and the state has been generous in extending funding beyond original plan

-Finding ways for State Library to continue full funding--unrealistic!

-It is hard for me to say what was least valuable since I found everything valuable and I would not have wanted to miss any part of the conference

-Morning session change was unwarranted. Some of us who have not actively compaigned for fundraising felt out of it and less effective. The issue is not fundraising but securing permanent funding. Coordinators are too stressed to have to devote the inordinate amount of time necessary to do fundraising

-Large group discussions which tended to be repetitious

G. OTHER COMMENTS?

-facilitators were excellent. I would have liked a more inspirational/emotional speech or presentation as a motivator

-Asilomar is great! Let's do this annually. Facilitators/recorders did a find job. Enjoyed time to meet\talk with other folks

-conference was a shot in the arm - sorely needed

-Excellent conference team & planner

-Perhaps a pre-retreat questionnaire requesting program concerns would have made made the "questions" more relevant to the needs of attendees

-Very interesting to see group priorities during small sessions

-I was extremely impressed with the facilitators. The retreat was efficiently managed. Location of retreat also great

-overall - an excellent, well-organized retreat--a model of what a retreat should be

-A neat job by all facilitators. Meeting on Friday a.m. could have worked better perhaps without mixing levels (e.g. all coordinators, etc.) Break of Coordinators Thursday was strange - all Bay area projects except 1 or 2 were in same group

-Would have liked a key note speaker from outside of the program - like Marti? More discussion of state funding possibilities. Too many speeches by Strong.

-Gary's personal commitment to literacy is admirable. It has encouraged Library Directors to focus on literacy and to give this large block of time to this issue

-Facilitators was excellent!

-should have TV in rooms. Transportation to area sights of interest

-I am impressed with the quality of the facilitators. I loved the setting. I enjoyed getting to know the state consultants, particularly Al Bennett and Paul Kiley. It was valuable for me to hear Gary Strong give his views

Appendix VIII-g

OPEN-ENDED EVALUATIONS BY PERSONS NOT SELF-IDENTIFIED

E. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST VALUABLE ABOUT THE RETREAT?

-Seeing and hearing the various ways that people are doing what they're doing. Having a chance to get away from a very busy office to reflect

-Focus on single topic with enthusiastic sharing by participants who have "discovered" and embraced another level of basic service

-the opportunity for Directors of Libraries to be involved and know what was happening in other literacy programs as well as know what was happening in their own!!

-Synergy evidenced by all levels of CLC involvement--creativity, motivation, dedication to a purpose. Fantastic organization, logistics, facilitators and coordination

F. WHAT WAS LEAST VALUABLE TO YOU?

-A process that was so structured towards getting ideas out and restated to the entire group; the result was that we had no experience of getting our teeth into anything important. We are talented and isolated. We need to operate our programs, but when we come together, we should be able to focus our group energy to problem-solve how to deal with some major issues collectively. i.e. I would have liked less time spent hearing what we already know and spend small group time really working on issues. For example-the 5 key issues were identified & a few options (we couldn't even own solutions) were listed. A natural progression of this first round of brainstorming on issues could have been to have the Friday morning groups be issue groups. And people could choose one issue to go to and really work on action plans to address the issue. In that way we could have gotten fundraising dealt with, library/literacy role dealt with etc. Then those groups could have reported back with a lot more to the whole group. Rather than four groups reporting on basically the same stuff. I do appreciate the talent of the facilitators.

-Breakfast

-Everything that happened was valuable to me

G. OTHER COMMENTS?

-evidence of clear, long range, helpful State Library leadership

-Retreats and several day meetings are especially valuable for motivation and visible recognition of staff and employees who are often deeply committed and making a valuable contribution but not often acknowledged. The opportunity to talk with such persons is a reward of incalcuable value

-This was the very first opportunity that I've had to see a conference "facilitated" and I was throughly impressed. Marilyn has done a fantastic job!!

Appendix VIII-h

CLS BOARD MEMBERS' OPEN-ENDED EVALUATIONS

E. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST VALUABLE ABOUT THE RETREAT?

-The sharing of information among directors and administrators and discovering that it is a shared venture. The support of all persons involved. The opportunity to group together and meet others across the state involved in the program. The sharing of information concerning operation, funding, programs, etc. The location and service was great. The excitement about the program across the state

-As a CLSB member--being able to listen to the Coordinators as well as the Directors--also to hear a great many problems throughout the state and the common problem to all, large and small--funding.

-Information from coordinators group about how the program is working at the local levels and their concerns about continuance

-getting the people involved in literacy together to share experiences

-the opportunity to meet, talk with and hear the problems/successes of those involved in CLC

F. WHAT WAS LEAST VALUABLE TO YOU?

-A little too long

-All was valuable

-Talking to the saved didn't help spread the word to those not already in the program or to those who may have to fund it in the future -- too much wasted time due to plane schedules to Monterey--came in early Wednesday--no room then--leave late Friday--no room then either

-I found it a totally valuable experience

G. OTHER COMMENTS?

-If held again, two days should be adequate - mind and concentration began to slip on last day. Last night could have been the summing up - and check out after breakfast. Some of us have a long way to go

-the facilitators and recorders were excellent, retreat was well planned and proceeded on time which went well with the importance of the content. Location and weather were wonderful!!!

IX. GENERAL APPENDIX

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT
Participant List
by Library

Ginnie Cooper
County Librarian
Alameda County Library

Carolyn Moskovitiz
Branch Manager of Extension Services
Alameda County Library

Irene Yarrow
CLC Coordinator
Alameda County Library

Dimity L. Jefferis
CLC Coordinator
Alameda Free Library

Peg McGowen
Alameda Free Library

James Elsaas
CLC Coordinator
Auburn-Placer County Library

Dorothy Sanborn
County Librarian
Auburn-Placer County Library

Virginia Aguirre
CLC Coordinator
(Santa Paula) Blanchard Community Library

Daniel O. Robles
District Librarian
(Santa Paula) Blanchard Community Library

Joy Diloreto
(Monterey Park) Bruggemeyer Memorial Library

Colin Lucas
(Monterey Park) Bruggemeyer Memorial Library

Naomi Quinonez
CLC Coordinator
(Monterey Park) Bruggemeyer Memorial Library

Jeanette Richard
CLC Coordinator
Butte County Library

Josephine R. Terry
County Librarian
Butte County Library

Linda Jones
CLC Coordinator
Carlsbad City Library

Clifford E. Lange
Carlsbad City Library

Robert W. Conover
Commerce Public Library

Cathay O. Reta
CLC Coordinator
Commerce Public Library

Rose-Marie Kennedy
Library Community Services Coordinator
Contra Costa County Library

Ernest Siegel
County Librarian
Contra Costa County Library

Carole Talan
CLC Coordinator
Contra Costa County Library

Pam Alger
CLC Coordinator
Downey City Library

Vikie Jenkins
City Librarian
Downey City Library

John K. Kallenberg
County Librarian
Fresno County Library

Marie Stanley
Principal Librarian
Fresno County Library

Carol Scroggins Wilson
CLC Coordinator
Fresno County Library

James Boulton
Hemet Public Library

Jackie Peasnick
CLC Coordinator
Hemet Public Library

Judy Klapproth
County Librarian
Humboldt County Library

Lilli Sommer
CLC Coordinator
Humboldt County Library

Lyvier Conss
CLC Coordinator
Imperial County Library

Bernita Fulmer
County Librarian
Imperial County Library

Pat Osbey
CLC Coordinator
Kern County Library

Phyllis T. Pacheco
Deputy Director of Libraries
Kern County Library

Luis Herrera
Associate Director for Branch Libraries
Long Beach Public Library

Cordelia Howard
Long Beach Public Library

Ruth Stewart
CLC Coordinator
Long Beach Public Library

Barbara H. Clark
Administrative Principal Librarian
Los Angeles Public Library

Suzanne N. Johnson
CLC Coordinator
Los Angeles Public Library

Wyman Jones
City Librarian
Los Angeles Public Library

Linda F. Crismond
County Librarian
Los Angeles County Public Library

Marilee Marrero
CLC Coordinator
Los Angeles County Public Library

Margaret C. Wong
Chief of Public Services
Los Angeles County Public Library

Sharon Hammer
County Librarian
Marin County Library

Barbara Hughes
Administrative Librabrian
Marin County Library

Philip MacDonald
CLC Coordinator
Marin County Library

Norman E. Hallam
County Librarian
Mendocino County Library

Roberta M. Valdez
CLC Coordinator
Mendocino County Library

Karen Fredrickson
Menlo Park Public Library

Judith Ann Wilczak, Ed.D.
CLC Coordinator
Menlo Park Public Library

Deanna Kobayashi
Public Services Librarian
Merced County

Emiko Tanioka
CLC Coordinator
Merced County

Linda Wilson
County Librarian
Merced County

Betty J. Chism
County Librarian
Modoc County

Jim Halverson
CLC Coordinator
Modoc County

Tom Trice
Associate Director
Napa City-County Library

Frances William
CLC Coordinator
Napa City-County Library

Jose L. Cruz
CLC Coordinator
National City Public Library

Shula Monroe
City Librarian
National City Public Library

Christine Saed
CLC Coordinator
Oakland Public Library

Lelia White
Oakland Public Library

Clara DiFelice
Outreach Librarian
Palm Springs Public Library

Victoria L. Johnson
CLC Coordinator
Pasadena Public Library

Sally Martin
Principal Librarian
Pasadena Public Library

Edward M. Szynaka
Pasadena Public Library

Suad S. Ammar
CLC Coordinator
Placentia Library District

David E. Snow
Placentia Library District

Maria Contreras
City Librarian
Richmond Public Library

Sharon Pastori
CLC Coordinator
Richmond Public Library

Irene Liebenberg
Riverside City and County Public Library

Jeneice Sorrentino
CLC Coordinator
Riverside City and County Public Library

Linda Wood
County Librarian
Riverside City and County Public Library

Mae Bolton
Supervising Librarian
Sacramento Public Library

Janet E. Larson
Sacramento Public Library

Kay Christian
CLC Coordinator
Sacramento Public Library

John Gross
Salinas Public Library

Patricia Jones
CLC Coordinator
Salinas Public Library

Barbara Anderson
County Librarian
San Bernardino County Library

Carol Bowse
CLC Coordinator
San Bernardino County Library

Pamela Carlisle
CLC Coordinator
San Diego County Library

Barbara L. Loomis
San Diego County Library

Cathrine E. Lucas
County Librarian
San Diego County Library

Olive W. Gamble
CLC Coordinator
San Francisco Public Library

Anne Kincaid
Coordinator of Adult Services
San Francisco Public Library

Lyn Vivrette
CLC Coordinator
San Luis Obispo City-County Library

Dale W. Perkins
County Librarian
San Luis Obispo City-County Librarian

Nancy Crabbe
City Librarian
San Mateo Public Library

Margaret Egan
San Mateo Public Library

Maura Okamoto
CLC Coordinator
San Mateo Public Library

Sandra M. Newkirt
CLC Coordinator
Santa Ana Public Library

Margaret Jean Owens
Head of Extension Services
Santa Ana Public Library

Robert J. Richard
Santa Ana Public Library

Ed Cavallini
Santa Clara County Library

Brenda Gray
CLC Coordinator
Santa Clara County Library

Susan Fuller
County Librarian
Santa Clara County Library

Diane Barry
Sdhasta County Library

Tim Mallory
CLC Coordinator
Shasta County Library

Diane Duquette
County Librarian
Shasta County Library

Brian Reynolds
County Librarian
Siskiyou County Library

Wendy Reynolds
CLC Coordinator
Siskiyou County Library

Jeanne Goodrich
City Librarian
South San Francisco/Daly City Public Library

Leslie H. Shelton
CLC Coordinator
South San Francisco/Daly City Public Library

Donna Brown
Assistant Director of Library Services
Stockton - San Joaquin County Public Library

Patricia Torbett
CLC Coordinator
Stockton - San Joaquin County Public Library

Ursula Meyer
County Librarian
Stockton - San Joaquin County Public Library

Dixie Adeniran
County Librarian
Ventura County Library Services Agency

Bobette W. Host
CLC Coordinator
Ventura County Library Services Agency

Catherine Penprase
Adult Services Coordinator
Ventura County Library Services Agency

Margaret Pedulla
CLC Coordinator
Watsonville Public Library

Seely Sumpf
Watsonville Public Library

Leslie Malek de Pasian
CLC Coordinator
Woodland Library

Nancy Kellum-Rose
Woodland Public Library

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY STAFF

Gary E. Strong
State Librarian
California State Library

Nancy W. Percy
Assistant State Librarian
California State Library

Yolanda J. Cuesta
Bureau Chief Library Development Services
California State Library

John Amend
Regional Consultant
California State Library

Al Bennett
Literacy Specialist
California State Library

Jim Henson
Regioanl Consultant
California State Library

Paul M. Kiley
Specialist: Community Organization and Communication
California State Library

Ann E. Kirkland
Regional Consultant
California State Library

Cameron D. Robertson
Program Manager, CLSA
California State Library

Carmela Ruby
Consultant
California State Library

CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD

Lois O. Clark
President
CLSB

Effie Lee Morris
Vice President
CLSB

Barbara L. Davis
CLSB Member

Nancy King
CLSB Member

Marie Logan
CLSB Member

Marilyn E. Stevenson
CLSB Member

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT
Retreat Resource People

Martha Lane
Retreat Evaluator

Connie Shapiro
Retreat Coordinator

Marilyn Snider
Retreat Facilitator

Jayne Becker
Recorder

Kathy Ferber
Facilitator

Sally Sprague
Recorder

Bonnie Jameson
Facilitator

Gail Tsuboi
Recorder

Barbara Shaw
Facilitator

Pat Johnson
Recorder

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN RETREAT CHANGES
February 23, 1987

Cancalled:	Replacement:
Phyllis T. Pacheco Deputy Director of Libraries Kern County Public Library	Elaine Kanode Acquisition Librarian Kern County Public Library
Ernest Siegel Director, County Librarian Contra Costa County Library	Esther Helfand Assistant County Librarian Contra Costa County Library
Janet Larson Acting Library Director Sacramento Public Library	
Irene Leibenberg Supervisor Riverside City and County Public Library	
Robert Conover Director Commerce Public Library	